



1933

## Cleveland and the Hawaiian question 1893

Anna Swenson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

---

### Recommended Citation

Swenson, Anna, "Cleveland and the Hawaiian question 1893" (1933). *Theses and Dissertations*. 653.  
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/653>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

*Dr. Libby's Copy*

CLEVELAND AND THE HAWAIIAN QUESTION

1893

A Thesis Presented for the  
Degree of Master of Arts

by

Anna Swenson

The University of North Dakota

1933



T1933  
S97  
exp 2

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Chapter I

#### The Hawaiian Islands

Background .....	1
Constitutional Growth.....	3
Revolution of 1893.....	7
Landing of Troops.....	13
Establishment of Provisional Government .....	21
New Government Recognized .....	26
Annexation to United States .....	27
Protectorate Proclaimed .....	28

### Chapter II

President Harrison's Message of February 15, 1893 ....	29
Queen's Letters to President Harrison and Cleveland ..	31
Queen's Commissioners' Arrival in Washington .....	32
Princess Kaulani's Visit to Washington .....	34
Cleveland Withdraws Treaty of Annexation from Senate .	34
Cleveland's Annual Message of December 4, 1893 .....	34
Cleveland's Special Message of December 18, 1893 .....	35

### Chapter III

Resolutions Offered in House of Representatives .....	50
Debate on Resolutions .....	54
Arguments for and against Stevens .....	58
Summing Up of Main Facts .....	65
Location of Troops Described .....	67
Republicans After President for Political Purposes ...	76
Vote on Resolutions .....	77

### Chapter IV

Resolution Offered in Senate .....	79
Debate in Senate .....	80
Committee Presents Report in Senate .....	87
Discussion of Report .....	88
Conclusions .....	103

Bibliography .....	108
--------------------	-----



## CHAPTER 1

The Hawaiian Islands consist of a chain of islands in the north Pacific Ocean, being 2100 miles from San Francisco and 5000 miles from Hongkong. They occupy a central position and all trade routes in the north Pacific go thru the islands or in close proximity to them. They are on the direct way from Panama to Hongkong, and directly on the shortest line from the Columbia River or Puget Sound to Australia. Here the two great lines of commerce of the Pacific Ocean intersect, and vessels must stop there for refreshment and refuge.<sup>1</sup> The first company of Missionaries from New England arrived in Hawaii on March 31, 1820. Fourteen other companies followed during the next thirty-five years, in all over 150 men and women--ministers, teachers, physicians, printers, farmers and business men. They introduced<sup>2</sup> the church, the school and the press.

At an early period in the intercourse of the natives with white men the traffic in sandalwood assumed great importance. China being the chief country for the consumption of sandalwood, the American sandalwood traders, having obtained a cargo, were accustomed to convey it there for a market, afterward in-

- .....
1. Senate Reports, 53 Cong., 2nd Sess., Ser. No. 3180, Washington, D. C., 1895, 103.
  2. Encyclopædia Britannica, New York City, 1929, XI., 271.



vesting the proceeds of their sales in teas, silks, and other products of the Orient.<sup>3</sup> The whale-fisheries of the United States which in the earlier part of this country formed an important part of the business of New England seaports, maintained a close connection with the Hawaiian Islands. The supply of whales was far greater in the Pacific than in the Atlantic Ocean, and vessels in great numbers from New England frequently found it necessary to touch at the islands for repairs or for fresh provisions and other supplies. As early as the year 1823 it was not uncommon to find from forty to sixty American whale-ships at anchor at one time in the harbor of Honolulu. From January 1, 1836, to the end of 1841, a period of six years, no fewer than three hundred and fifty-eight vessels hailing from American ports touched at this port, of which fully four-fifths were whale-ships.<sup>4</sup> The promoters of the American whale-fisheries soon discovered that time and money might be saved by unloading their oil at Honolulu for transshipment in merchant vessels. Then having replenished their provisions, water, and other needed articles,

.....

3. Carpenter, America in Hawaii, Boston, 1899, 31.

4. Ibid., 109.



they would return to the fishing grounds. The whale-fisheries had reached their maximum development in 1854, but after that<sup>5</sup> year they began to decline.

The decline of the whale-fisheries, however, did not produce a corresponding decline of American interests in the Hawaiian Islands. As early as 1835 the sugar industry was started. American capital was invested in Hawaiian lands and large sugar plantations were built up. And so upon the ruins of one American industry rose another, far more lucrative and important, and one destined to aid in cementing the commercial<sup>6</sup> interests of the two countries.

Meanwhile, due to the increasing complications with foreigners, a conviction arose to the need of a better defined and more advanced form of government as a condition of peace, progress and independence.<sup>7</sup> The declaration of rights and the first code of laws were drawn up in 1839. These produced a feeling of security unknown before, and formed the first step in establishing individual property in land. Their ruler guaranteed religious liberty, which led to the edict of toleration issued by the king, June 17, 1839. In 1840 the

.....

5. Carpenter, op. cit., 120.

6. Senate Reports, op. cit., 11., 316.

7. Ibid., 317.



first constitution was drawn up in a similar manner and approved in a general council of the chiefs. It was then signed by the king and the premier and proclaimed, October 8, 1840. It was extremely simple and loosely drawn up and left most of the power in the hands of the king.<sup>8</sup>

On the 28th of November, 1843, the two governments of France and England united in recognizing "the existence in the Sandwich Islands of a government capable of providing for the regularity of its relations with foreign nations."<sup>9</sup> But it was soon perceived by the friends of the nation that much yet remained to be done in order to organize a civilized government, worthy of such recognition. There was a slow but steady growth in constitutional government during the Kamehameha dynasty which came to an end in 1873. As there was no heir to the throne Lunalilo, by birth the highest in the line of chiefs, was elected king. At his death, Kalakaua, after a conflict with the opposing party, was sworn in as king, February 13, 1847, under the protection of the United States troops, and for several years he depended upon the support of the foreign community.

The evil tendencies which had begun to show themselves during the reign of Kamehameha V went on increasing during the reign .....

8. Senate Reports, op. cit., 11., 317.

9. House Executive Documents, Ser. No. 3224, 53 Cong., 2d Sess., Washington, D. C., 1895, XXV11., 180.



of Kalakaua. Thru interference at elections, by 1886 almost all the candidates of the king's party were office holders. The personal interference of the king in politics was carried to an extent unheard of before, while the constitutional precedents of former reigns were wholly disregarded. The government was in danger of becoming an Asiatic despotism, when the revolution of 1887 took place and Kalakaua was compelled to sign and proclaim a new constitution, July 6, 1887.<sup>10</sup> The most important changes made in the constitution of 1887 were to put a limit on the power of the king and an end to his personal government. The franchise was extended to foreigners who had up to this time been practically debarred from naturalization, and the ministry was made responsible to the people thru the legislature<sup>11</sup> instead of to the king as formerly.

Upon Kalakaua's death he was succeeded by his sister, Liliuokaulani. For a time it was thought that the Queen would profit by the experience of her brother, and whatever apprehensions were aroused at the time of her assuming the crown were allayed by the promptness with which she took the oath to support the constitution of 1887. But as time wore on she

.....

10. Senate Reports, op. cit., 11., 321.

11. Chambers, Constitutional History of Hawaii, Baltimore, Md., 1896, 25.



leaned more and more to the policy of Kalakaua. There is no doubt but that she was largely influenced by certain adventurers who had succeeded in ingratiating themselves in her favor. Legislative intrigues, in which the Queen was personally concerned, became common again. The appearance of the lottery and opium rings complicated matters. Violations of the constitution became more and more flagrant. The cabinet that interposed serious objections to these violations was, by the Queen's influence, voted out of office, and a new one plastic to her manipulations appointed in its stead.<sup>12</sup>

Paying no heed to the protests of her people, the Queen at length took the final step that caused her downfall, namely, the announcement that she was about to proclaim a new constitution. Kamehameha V had done the same thing in 1864, with some degree of success. But the times had advanced since then, and the intelligent people of the islands did not propose to have any of their liberties abrogated, nor suffer the loss of representative government under which their lives and property were secure. It needed but such an announcement to arouse them to decided action.<sup>13</sup> Thru personal exertions of the Queen the lottery and opium bills were passed by the Legislature of 1892.

.....

12. Chambers, op. cit., 25.

13. Ibid., 25.



and the Wilcox-Jones cabinet was voted out. She then appointed a new cabinet that was willing to do her bidding, and this aroused a general feeling of indignation among the people. There was, however, no thought of any revolutionary action, or of any opposition to the existing government except within the limits<sup>14</sup> of the constitution.

On January 4, 1893, the U. S. cruiser Boston, under command of Captain Wiltse, had sailed for Hilo, with Minister Stevens, as a passenger. They returned on the fourteenth and found themselves in the midst of a revolution.<sup>15</sup> The prorogation of the Legislature was to take place at noon, and the members opposed to the new cabinet, though they absented themselves from the ceremony, had no idea of attempting anything against the ministry. It did not seem possible that the Queen, after having gained everything for which she had been striving, would imperil her gains by violating the constitution.

On Saturday morning, January 14, 1893, one of the Queen's ministers received positive information that a new constitution was to be proclaimed in the afternoon. After a conference with Thurston and Hartwell, two prominent citizens, he was advised to refuse to sign a new constitution and to decline to resign if

.....  
14. House Executive Documents, 53 Cong., 3rd Sess., Ser. No. 3294, 111., Washington, D. C. 1895, 778.

15. Ibid., 111., 778.



his resignation should be demanded. The prorogation of the Legislature took place at noon, January 14, 1893. Immediately after the prorogation, the Hui Kalaiana, a native Hawaiian political society, marched over to the palace in order to present a new constitution to the Queen, with the petition that it be promulgated to the people as the fundamental law of the land. The matter of the new constitution and the petition had been prearranged, it really originated with the Queen and a few of her adherents. Activity had been noted for several days among some of the native retainers of Her Majesty and several of them later certified that they were ordered to appear before her and ask for a new constitution.

The Queen retired to the blue room and summoned the ministers, who repaired at once to the palace. She at once presented them with the draft of the new constitution, demanded their signatures, and declared her intention to promulgate it at once. Attorney-general Peterson and Ministers Colburn, Cornwell, and Parker refused to do so. All the cabinet now perceived the expediency of advising Her Majesty not to violate the law, but she was not to be dissuaded. She frankly told the cabinet that she did not wish to hear any more advice, that she intended to promulgate the .....

16. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 779.



new constitution immediately. Then she told them that unless they abandoned their resistance at once she would go out upon the steps of the palace and tell the excited crowd assembled there that she wished to give them a new constitution, but that her ministers were inside the palace, hindering her from doing it. The ministers knew what the threat might mean, and before<sup>17</sup> it could be put into execution they retired from the palace.

The Queen's ministers sent word to some of the leading citizens, asking what support they could expect in resisting the Queen's revolutionary movement. These citizens met in Smith's office and agreed to support the ministers and to resist the movement started by the Queen. A message to that effect was sent to the cabinet. The ministers then went back to the palace and tried to persuade the Queen to give up her intention of proclaiming a new constitution. She finally con-<sup>18</sup>sented to a temporary postponement. But the Queen was very angry when at 4 p. m. Saturday, she returned to the throne room, where were assembled the Hui Kalaiana, with most of the Legislature, the cabinet, the governor of Oahu, and others. She ascended the dais and spoke substantially as follow:

.....

17. House Executive Documents, op. cit., lll., 779.

18. Ibid., lll., 780.



"Princes, Nobles, and Representatives:

I have listened to the thousands of voices of my people that have come to me, and I am prepared to grant their request. The present constitution is full of defects, as the chief justice here will testify, as questions regarding it have so often come before him for settlement. It is so faulty that I think a new one should be granted. I have prepared one, in which the rights of all have been regarded--a constitution suited to the wish of the people. I was ready and expected to proclaim the new constitution today, as a suitable occasion for it, and thus satisfy the wishes of my dear people. But, with deep regret, I say that I have met with obstacles that prevent it. Return to your homes peaceably and quietly and continue to look towards me, and I will look towards you. Keep me ever in your love. I am obliged to postpone the granting of the constitution for a few days. I must confer with my cabinet, and when, after you return home, you may see it, receive it graciously. You have my love, and with sorrow I now dismiss you."

A few moments later the Queen went out upon the upper balcony of the palace and addressed the crowd assembled on the street. She told them that on account of the perfidy of her

.....

19. House Executive Documents, op. cit., lll., 780.



ministers she was unable to give them the constitution which she had promised them, but that she would take the earliest opportunity of procuring it for them.

News was brought to the citizens of the city that the attempt to carry the revolution thru had for the moment failed. The meeting, appreciating the fact that the trouble had just begun, did not break up, but continued the consideration of the emergency. A Committee of Safety, composed of seven foreigners and six natives, was formed, January 14, 1893, to which the further consideration of the situation was delegated, after which the assembly dispersed.<sup>20</sup>

The Committee of Safety acted promptly, sub-committees were appointed and Waterhouse and Bolte were assigned the duty of finding out what arms were available for the use of the provisional government. Bolte later testified that they had collected between 300 and 400 guns, chiefly Springfield and Winchester repeating rifles.<sup>21</sup> The Committee adjourned at 6 p. m. to meet again on the following (Sunday) morning. The situation was discussed in all its bearings, and it was decided to call a mass meeting, to make a report, and then ask this general gathering for authority to take whatever steps might seem necessary. It .....

20. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 781.

21. Ibid., XXV11., 252.



was the opinion of the members of the Committee that a proclamation should be issued abrogating the monarchy, and establishing a provisional government, providing the tone of feeling developed at the mass meeting should clearly indicate that such a course would be in accord with public sentiment. The Committee continued its meetings and began the work of organization and preparation. Monday morning it was decided to request the American minister to land troops for the protection of property. They felt troops would have a quieting effect on the natives and prevent any demonstration or hostile movement.<sup>22</sup> The following request to that effect was forwarded to the American minister:

"Sir: We, the undersigned citizens and residents of Honolulu, respectfully represent that, in view of recent public events in this kingdom, culminating in the revolutionary acts of the Queen on Saturday last, the public safety is menaced, and lives and property are in peril, and we appeal to you and the United States forces at your command for assistance.

The Queen, with the aid of an armed force, and accompanied by threats of violence and bloodshed from those with whom she was acting, attempted to proclaim a new constitution; and, while

.....

22. House Executive Documents, op. cit., XXVII., 35.



prevented for the time being from accomplishing her object, declared publicly that she would only defer her action.

This conduct and action was upon an occasion and under circumstances which have created general alarm and terror. We are unable to protect ourselves without aid and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces.

23  
Committee of Safety"

The response to that call does not appear in the files or on the records of the American legation. It, therefore, can not speak for itself. The request of the Committee of Safety was, however, consented to by the American minister, because the troops were landed.

The following communication was sent to Capt. Wiltse of the Boston shortly after receiving the above request:

"Sir: In view of the existing critical circumstances in Honolulu, including an inadequate legal force, I request you to land marines and sailors from the ship under your command for the protection of the United States legation and consulate, and to secure the safety of American life and property.

24  
John L. Stevens"

.....

23. House Executive Documents, op. cit., XXVI., 35.

24. Ibid., III., 208.



At 3 O'clock that same afternoon, Stevens made a personal visit to the ship Boston and had a talk with Captain Wiltse to make sure that the troops would be landed on time. On board the Boston the preparation for landing was already going on. The officers had received orders from Captain Wiltse between 12 and 1 o'clock to get their men ready for landing between four and five that afternoon.

The request for the landing of the U. S. troops is in itself an admission that the conspirators who sought to overthrow the government were helpless without the aid and protection of the United States, and that they were afraid of the opposition the Queen's forces might make. The request was made, too, by men avowedly intending to overthrow the existing government and to substitute a provisional government in its place. They naturally feared arrest and imprisonment, and, therefore, sought the aid of the American troops in this situation to prevent any harm to their persons and property. To consent to a request for such a purpose without any suggestion of dissuading them from it on the part of the American minister could not be construed otherwise than as complicity with the plans of the conspirators. The Committee, to use their own language, said:

.....



"We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and, therefore, pray for the protection of the United States forces." But, in less than thirty hours the petitioners had overturned the throne, established a new government, and obtained the recognition of foreign powers.<sup>25</sup>

The American minister had been in regular communication with the leaders of the revolutionary movement and gave them assurance of protection from danger at the hands of the royal government and forces.<sup>26</sup>

In the meantime the Queen's party was not idle. They were frightened at the tone of feeling manifested in the city, and began to cast about for means of averting the catastrophe which seemed to threaten the throne. A secret meeting was held in the office of the attorney-general in the government building, at which, besides the cabinet, Paul Neumann, Marshal Wilson, R. W. Wilcox, and others were present. Marshal Wilson proposed the arrest of the Committee of Thirteen, but Paul Neumann and others opposed the proposition on the ground that it would cause friction. Posters issued by the Committee of Safety for the mass meeting of the citizens were already out and it was decided to

.....

25. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 587.

26. Ibid., 111., 589.



call a counter mass meeting of Hawaiians at Palace Square. A notice was drafted "by authority" to be signed by the Queen and the cabinet announcing that her intention to abrogate the constitution by force had been abandoned.<sup>27</sup>

Late Monday morning the notice was distributed. It was as follows: "Her Majesty's ministers desire to express their appreciation for the quiet and order which have prevailed in this community since the events of Saturday, and are authorized to say that the position taken by Her Majesty in regard to the promulgation of a new constitution was under stress of her native subjects. Authority is given for the assurance that any changes desired in the fundamental law of the land will be sought only by the methods provided in the constitution itself. Her Majesty's ministers request all citizens to accept the assurance of Her Majesty in the same spirit in which it is given."<sup>28</sup> At the

Palace Square meeting a resolution was adopted in which they first, supported the Queen's opposition to the constitution of 1887, and, second, accepted the royal assurance that she would no longer seek a new constitution by revolutionary means.

.....

27. House Executive Documents, op. cit., lll., 781.

28. Ibid., XXVI., 8.



At 2 p. m. Monday, January 16, the mass meeting, called by the Committee of Safety, met at the armory. The notice of the meeting had been posted early Monday morning in conspicuous places around town and it also came out in the newspapers. It was to the effect that "all who were opposed to the late revolutionary methods of the Queen should meet at the armory at 2 p. m. that day." It was called for the purpose of protesting against the revolutionary aggressions of the Queen. Before 2 o'clock the large building was crowded to its capacity, 1260 being present by actual count, while many others came later. Every class in the community was fully represented, mechanics, merchants, professional men, and artisans of every kind being present.<sup>29</sup>

The meeting was intensely enthusiastic and W. C. Wilder of the Committee of Safety was appointed by acclamation as chairman of the meeting. Speeches were held by Wilder, Glade, Young, Bolts, Blawin, Emmeluth, and Greene. Wilder in his speech explained the purpose of the meeting, saying an impromptu meeting of citizens had been called last Saturday to take measures for the public safety. The report of that meet-

.....

29. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 950.



ing would be read to them. That they did not meet as revolutionists but as peaceful citizens who have a right to meet and state their grievances, and that they would have the courage to maintain those rights.

Thurston then read the report of the Committee of Safety, consisting of a short history of the events which had taken place from the 14th to the 16th of January. This explained how a public meeting of citizens held in Honolulu on the 14th of January, had appointed a Committee of Safety to consider the situation, and to devise ways and means for the maintenance of the public peace and safety, and the preservation of life and property. The Committee had recommended the calling of this mass meeting of citizens to protest against and condemn such action. The report also denounced the action of the Queen and her supporters as being unlawful, unwarranted, in derogation of the rights of the people, endangering the peace of the community, tending to excite riot and causing the loss of life and destruction of property. The following resolutions were presented for adoption at the mass meeting: "Therefore, we, the citizens of Honolulu, do hereby condemn the Queen and her supporters; And, we do hereby ratify

.....



the appointment and indorse the action taken and the report made by the Committee of Safety; and we do hereby further empower such Committee to further consider the situation and further devise such ways and means as may be necessary to secure the permanent maintenance of law and order, and the protection of life, liberty, and property in Hawaii."<sup>30</sup>

After reading the report Thurston made a few comments explaining that the constitution gave them the right to assemble peacefully to express their grievances, and the men who had not the spirit to rise after this menace to their liberties had no right to keep them. Chairman Wilder read the resolutions again after several speeches were made and they then passed by a unanimous standing vote.<sup>31</sup> No reference, whatever, was made in the speeches to a change in government nor of the intention to dethrone the Queen. Neither was there any mention made about asking the United States minister to land the U. S. troops, and, therefore, could not have had the support of this mass meeting.

Immediately after the mass meeting a session of the Committee of Safety was held. All the members felt that their action had been more than indorsed by the citizens, and that

.....

30. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 783.

31. Ibid., 111., 784.



the moment a provisional government was established the foreign community would rally to its support. The call for troops, however, had not been indorsed by the citizens because it had been kept from public knowledge, and they were much surprised when they saw the troops land and were very curious to know why they were in the city.

Marshal Wilson had warned all persons not to attend the mass meeting and indications of approaching trouble seemed serious. Minister Stevens had complied with the request of the Committee of Safety and at 5 o'clock in the evening the ship's battalion, composed of about 160 men, under Lieut. Commander Swinburne landed at Brewer's wharf, marched up Fort street to the office of Severance, consul-general for the United States, where a halt was made. One company of 36 men was detached and left to guard the American legation on Nuuanu street and the consulate, after which the remainder moved out Merchant street to King, and came to a halt in front of J. A. Hopper's residence. From there they went to Atherton's residence where they stayed till about nine in the evening, after which they went to Arion Hall, where they made their temporary headquarters. In the meantime the Old Bishop premises on King

.....



street had been prepared for the officers and men, and on Thursday, January 19, they were installed at that place and stayed there until ordered back to the Boston, April 1, by Blount.<sup>32</sup> In the evening, Monday, January 16th, the Committee of Safety again met, and elected the executive council and officers. On Tuesday morning, the 17th, the members of the executive council consented to serve, and Soper was induced to accept the responsible position of military chief of the new government. Judge Dole, the new executive head, sent his resignation to the cabinet. At 1 p. m., Tuesday, January 17, 1893, the formation of the advisory council was complete, and shortly after the proclamation was signed by the Committee of Safety. The first act of the provisional government was then to sign the commission of Soper as commander of the forces.

At about 2:30 on January 17, 1893, the Committee of Safety with the members of the provisional government proceeded to the government building, Judge Dole and Cooper leading the way up Merchant street. They were all unarmed. When the building was reached, inquiry was made for the ministers but they were not to be found. Cooper then made demand upon Hassinger, the chief clerk of the Interior office, for possession of the build-  
.....

32. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 791.



ing, and the demand was immediately complied with, there being no force with which any resistance could have been made. The Committee then proceeded to the public entrance, and Cooper read the proclamation to the gathering crowd, with the United States marines drawn up at Arion Hall about seventy-five yards from the government building, with two Gatling guns.<sup>33</sup>

This proclamation gave a resume of the history of the Hawaiian government from the time of the Kamehameha dynasty to the present time and announced the following change in government. The Hawaiian monarchy was abrogated. A provisional government for the control and management of public affairs and the protection of the public peace was established, to exist until terms of union with the United States of America had been negotiated and agreed upon.

Such provisional government should consist of an executive council of four members, who was to administer the executive departments of the government. There was also to be the advisory council, consisting of fourteen members with general legislative authority. All Hawaiian laws and constitutional principles not inconsistent with this proclamation were to continue in force until further order of the executive councils.<sup>34</sup>

.....

33. House Executive Documents, op. cit., lll., 787.

34. Ibid., lll., 789.



During the reading of the proclamation the armed followers of the provisional government began to gather. By the time the reading was finished Captain Ziegler reached the spot with some of his men, and, soon afterward from 150 to 200 armed men were present.

The armory on Beretania street had been selected for the assembling of the volunteers, and here with arms and ammunition ready for active work was a company composed of German citizens who were under the command of Captain Ziegler. They were soon joined by two companies under command of Potter and Fisher. Each man was armed with a rifle and had a cartridge belt around his waist. When they were mustered together, an order came from Commander Soper to march at once to the government building to prevent any possible uprising. The companies at once repaired in squads to the government building. Orders were given to clear the yard and sentries were stationed at the gates to prevent outsiders from entering.

35

As soon as it was generally known about the town that a new government was established, citizens of all classes rallied to its support, and before nightfall, four companies under arms were organized to uphold the new government and carry it through. A .....

35. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 789.



temporary organization was formed with Soper at the head. He named his aides and placed them in command of the different companies.<sup>36</sup>

The new government now took possession of the treasury and all the other departments. The first order issued by the provisional government was that all persons favorable to the new government were requested to furnish to the government such arms and ammunition as they had in their possession, in order that efficient and complete protection to life and property and the public peace might immediately and efficiently be put into operation.

The second order suspended the writ of habeas corpus and declared martial law to exist throughout the island of Oahu. Both these were issued shortly after 3 p. m. on January 17,<sup>37</sup> 1893.

The Queen's cabinet was summoned to surrender the palace, police station, and barracks shortly after the new government had been established. The officers would not agree to do this without the Queen's consent, but after a conference with the Queen, where Damon represented the provisional government, the Queen abdicated under following protest:

.....

36. House Executive Documents, op. cit., lll., 789.

37. Ibid., lll., 789.



"I, Liliuokalani, by the grace of God and under the constitution of the Hawaiian kingdom, Queen do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done against myself and the constitutional government of the Hawaiian kingdom by certain persons claiming to have established a provisional government of and for this kingdom.

"That I yield to the superior forces of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, his excellency John L. Stevens has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said provisional government.

"Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces, and perhaps the loss of life, I do under this protest and impelled by said force yield my authority until such time as the government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representative and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

"Done at Honolulu the 17th day of January, 1893, A. D." <sup>38</sup>

On Wednesday the 18th, new recruits kept constantly pouring in from all quarters until about 500 men were enrolled.

.....

38. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 232.



The taking of the barracks and the police station furnished the government with a large amount of ammunition and arms which was immediately distributed among the forces of the government. The government building was transformed into barracks where the government soldiers stayed. On the 23rd of January the executive and advisory councils of the government decided to organize a national guard of four companies, one company to be a permanent force under pay and to consist of 100 men, while three companies were to be volunteers.

The next day the work of enlisting men for the permanent force commenced in Arion Hall, where chief Justice Judd, Associate Justice Bickerton, and Circuit Judges Whiting and Frear were present to administer the oath of allegiance. In the evening the volunteer military companies were organized at the government building.<sup>39</sup>

As soon as the provisional government was in possession of the government building, it sent notifications to all the representatives of the foreign powers. Minister Stevens of the United States recognized the provisional government some time between 3:30 and 5 p. m. on January 17. That was before the provisional government was in possession of the palace, barracks,  
.....

39. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 791.



and police station, as those were surrendered after 7 p. m. on January 17. The other foreign countries did not recognize the new government before January 18, while England delayed until  
40  
the 19th.

On the 19th of January, 1893, a commission was empowered to negotiate a treaty of union with the United States, and they left on the steamship Claudine for San Francisco. The commission was composed of Thurston, Wilder, Castle, Marsden and Carter. They reached San Francisco on January 28th and proceeded to  
41  
Washington the next day, where they arrived on February 3, 1893.

As a feeling of uneasiness and disquietude had spread thru Honolulu, it was thought wise to secure the direct assistance of the United States government in the preservation of property and the maintenance of order, and a request was forwarded by the government to the American minister to establish a protectorate pending the settlement of the negotiations at Washington. In accordance with the terms of this request, at 8:30 a. m., February 1, Captain Wiltse proceeded to the government building, and a few moments later the battalion from the Boston marched up the street, entered the grounds, and drew up  
.....

40. House Executive Documents, op. cit., III., 228.

41. Ibid., III., 792.



in front of the building. Detachments from the three volunteer companies were already drawn up in line, under command of their respective captains. Just before 9 o'clock, the flag, saluted by the troops and by the cannon of the Boston, was raised above the tower of the government building. The following proclamation was read:

"To the Hawaiian People:

At the request of the provisional government of the Hawaiian Islands, I hereby, in the name of the United States of America, assume protection of the Hawaiian Islands for the protection of life and property and occupation of public buildings and Hawaiian soil, so far as it may be necessary for the purpose specified, but not interfering with the administration of public affairs by the provisional government. This action is taken pending, and subject to, negotiations at Washington.

42  
John L. Stevens"

On Sunday, February 5, 1893, martial law was abrogated and the writ of habeas corpus restored. No use had been made of its suspension, and no political arrests of any kind were found  
43  
necessary.

.....  
42. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 792.

43. Ibid., XXVI., 327.

CHIEFLY IN BOND



## CHAPTER 11

The Hawaiian commissioners arrived in Washington February 3, 1893. Secretary of State Foster, representing the United States, in conference with these commissioners, drew up a treaty of annexation. President Harrison submitted this treaty to the Senate on February 15, in a message in which he urged prompt action by the Senate. In the message he said: "that he transmitted with a view to its ratification a treaty of annexation concluded February 14, 1893, between the Secretary of State Foster, who was duly empowered to act in that behalf on the part of the United States, and Lorin A. Thurston, W. R. Castle, W. C. Wilder, C. L. Carter, and Joseph Marsden, the commissioners on the part of the government of the Hawaiian Islands." He explained that the treaty was provisional in that it did not attempt to deal with the questions that would arise out of the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. The commissioners representing the Hawaiian government, however, had consented to leave to the future and "to the just and benevolent purposes of the United States" the adjustment of all such questions. The overthrow of the monarchy he said was not promoted by the United States government, but had its origin in what seemed to have

.....



been a reactionary and revolutionary policy on the part of the Queen, which put in serious peril all foreign interests as well as the decent administration of civil affairs and the peace of the islands.

He argued the restoration of the Queen to her throne was undesirable, if not impossible, and unless supported by the United States it would be accompanied by serious disaster and the disorganization of all business interests. The influence and interest of the United States in the islands must be increased and not diminished. There were two courses open to our government, either to establish a protectorate, or to annex the islands at once. The President advised annexation. This later policy would promote the best interests of the United States as it was essential that none of the other great powers should secure the islands. Because of their location they should logically belong to the United States, and any other disposition of them might be dangerous to the safety of the United States and to the peace of the world.

He urged that they act promptly in their approval of the treaty as in that way order could be restored under the provisional government until such time as Congress could provide<sup>1</sup> by legislation a permanent form of government for the islands.

.....  
1. Messages and Papers of the Presidents, New York City, 1897, XlII., 5783.



In the meantime on January 19, the ex-Queen sent a letter to President Harrison requesting that no steps be taken by the government of the United States until her side of the cause had been heard. No attention was paid to her letter so far as is known, by any one in the executive department. On February 2, she dispatched two commissioners to represent her case at Washington, Paul Neumann and Prince David. They were accompanied by E. C. Macfarlane, one of the ablest of the Queen's adherents. Paul Neumann carried with him not only a commission as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, but also full power of attorney. He was authorized in the first place to negotiate with the United States government for "such official or other consideration, benefit, or advantage" as could be obtained from the United States for herself and Kaiulani. If nothing official could be secured, he was then to arrange for "such pecuniary considerations, benefits and advantages, as could be secured from the United States and to execute in her name whatever release and acquittances of all her claims to the throne of the Hawaiian Islands as might be requisite to secure such

2

pecuniary consideration.

Neumann also took with him a letter signed by the Queen on

.....

2. Alexander, Hawaiian Monarchy and Revolution of 1893, Honolulu, 1896, 76.



the 31st of January, addressed to the president-elect Grover Cleveland, in which she asked for his "friendly assistance in granting redress for a wrong which we claim has been done to us, under color of the assistance of the naval forces of the United States in a friendly port." <sup>3</sup> As her attorney, Neumann had skillfully drawn up a statement of the circumstances attending the revolution, to support this contention that the Queen's surrender had been compelled by the forces of the U. S. S. Boston.

The ex-Queen's commissioners left San Francisco, February 11, reaching Washington on the 17th. Macfarlane and Prince David at once proceeded to New York to present her letter, together with a copy of Neumann's statement to Cleveland.

On their arrival there they had an interview with O'Brien, Cleveland's private secretary, thru whom they sent the documents to Cleveland at Lakewood. <sup>4</sup>

Cleveland immediately caused the statement to be published in the New York World. It is evident that he was much impressed at the outset with the belief that the late revolution was the

.....

3. House Executive Documents, op. cit., XXVll., 401.

4. Alexander, op. cit., 77.



result of a deeply laid conspiracy; aided and abetted by the United States minister and Captain Wiltse of the Boston. Because of that belief he investigated the Hawaiian question and found enough evidence to satisfy him that a thorough investigation was needed, otherwise he could hardly have acted with such vigor and promptness as soon as he became president.

Cleveland had personal friends in the Senate. Among them was Senator Gray on the Foreign Relations committee. Thru these the influence of the president-elect seems to have been felt in the attitude of the Democratic senators towards the treaty. Hostility to it also began to be expressed by Democrats in the House of Representatives. This opposition delayed the treaty in the Senate so that it was not ratified during Harrison's administration. Neumann had an interview on the 21st of February with Secretary Foster to whom he presented a copy of his statement and he also sent another copy to the Senate committee on Foreign Relations.

Meanwhile another party appeared upon the scene, Princess Kaiulani, a daughter of a younger sister of the Queen and heir presumptive to the throne of Hawaii. She was seventeen years of age and had been residing some years in England for her education, under the guardianship of T. H. Davies, a gentleman

.....



who had amassed a large fortune in mercantile pursuits in Honolulu. On hearing of the deposition of the Queen, Davies at once took steps in the interest of his royal ward. While fully admitting the justice of the Queen's deposition, he protested against annexation, and proposed a regency in the name of Kaiulani, with Judge Dole at its head, to administer the government for three years, after which she should be installed as Queen.

On March 8, Davies and his ward reached Washington, where he was accorded a hearing by the President. The Princess was received at the White House on the 13th and they sailed back to England on the 21st.<sup>5</sup>

Cleveland became president on March 4, 1893. On March 9th, he withdrew the treaty of annexation from the Senate for the purpose of reexamination. In his annual message of December 4, 1893, he stated that the questions arising from our relations with Hawaii had caused him serious embarrassment. He had withdrawn the treaty of annexation which had been submitted to the Senate for ratification, and the 11th of March had dispatched, James H. Blount, of Georgia, to Honolulu as a special commissioner to make an impartial investigation. Blount had

.....

5. Alexander, op. cit., 78.



submitted his report which had convinced him, beyond all question, that the constitutional government of Hawaii had been subverted by the active aid of our representative to that government and thru the intimidation caused by the presence of an armed naval force from a United States cruiser, which was landed in Honolulu for that purpose at the instance of our minister. He felt that upon the facts reported, the only honorable course for this government to pursue was to undo the wrong that had been done by those representing us and restore as far as practicable the status existing at the time of our intervention. With this in view our newly appointed minister at Honolulu had received appropriate instructions to that end. No information of the accomplishment of any definite results had been received from him, but additional advices were expected. When received they would be sent to the Senate, accompanied by a special Executive message fully explaining the events leading up to the present situation.<sup>6</sup>

The special message was sent to the Senate, December 18, 1893. In this message he clearly sets forth the facts of the Hawaiian revolution and his conclusions after studying all the evidence presented.

.....

6. Messages and Papers of the Presidents, XlII., 5825.



He stated that when the present administration entered upon its duties, the Senate had under consideration a treaty providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the territory of the United States. Under the constitution and laws the enlargement of our limits is a manifestation of the highest attribute of sovereignty, and if entered upon as an Executive act all things relating to the transaction should be clear and free from suspicion. Additional importance is attached to this particular treaty of annexation because it contemplated a departure from unbroken American tradition in providing for additions to our territory of islands of the sea more than 2000 miles removed from our nearest coast. He said that this might not of itself have called for interference with the completion of the treaty, but it appeared from the documents accompanying the treaty when submitted to the Senate that the ownership of Hawaii was tendered to us by a provisional government set up to succeed the constitutional ruler of the Islands. This ruler had been dethroned, and it did not appear that such provisional government had the sanction of either popular revolution or suffrage. Two other features attracted his attention. One was the extraordinary haste characterizing all the transactions connected with the

.....



treaty. It appeared that the so-called Committee of Safety, which was ostensibly the center of the revolt, was organized on Saturday, January 14, 1893. On Monday, the 16th, the United States forces were landed at Honolulu from a naval vessel lying in its harbor, on the 17th the scheme of a provisional government was perfected, and a proclamation naming its officers was on the same day prepared and read at the government building, and immediately after the United States minister recognized the provisional government thus created. On January 19, two days afterwards, commissioners representing such government sailed for this country in a steamer especially chartered for the occasion. They arrived at San Francisco on the 28th of January and at Washington on February 3, 1893. On the 4th they had their first interview with the Secretary of State, and another interview on the 11th, at which date the treaty of annexation was agreed upon. On the 14th the treaty was formally concluded, and transmitted to the Senate on the 15th. This made only 32 days between the initiation of the scheme for a provisional government in Hawaii and the submission to the Senate of the annexation treaty, and fifteen days of this time were spent by the Hawaiian commissioners in their journey to Washington. He had not been able to explain this unusual haste but had especially marked it as something worthy of attention.

.....



In the next place he called the attention of the Senate to the undetermined issue of fact which he regarded as of vital importance in the Hawaiian revolution. President Harrison in his message accompanying the treaty declared that the overthrowing of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this government. A letter to the President from the Secretary of State, also submitted to the Senate with the treaty, stated that "At the time the provisional government took possession of the government buildings no troops, or officers, of the United States were present or took any part whatever in the proceedings. Recognition was not accorded to the provisional government by the United States minister until after the Queen's abdication and when they were in effective possession of the governmental buildings, archives, treasury, barracks, police station, and all the potential machinery of the government." A protest also accompanied the treaty, signed by the Queen and her ministers at the time she made way for the provisional government, which stated that she yielded to the superior force of the United States, whose minister caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and who declared he would support such provisional government. The truth or falsity of these official statements and of this protest was surely of the first importance, yet so

.....



far as he knew it had not been investigated.

The treaty was, therefore, withdrawn from the Senate for examination and Senator Blount was sent to Hawaii to investigate the circumstances of the Revolution. His report showed that a considerable proportion of American and other foreign merchants and traders residing in Honolulu favored annexation by the United States, and the project was zealously promoted by the minister representing the United States in that country. As early as November 19, 1892, Minister Stevens wrote a long letter to the Secretary of State, in which the case for annexation was elaborately argued on moral, political, and economic grounds. He refers to the loss of the Hawaiian sugar interests from the operation of the McKinley bill and the tendency to still further depreciation of sugar property unless some positive measure of relief was granted. He strongly inveighed against the existing Hawaiian government and emphatically declared for annexation. His declarations showed a disposition and condition of mind which might be usefully recalled when interpreting the significance of the later acts of the minister.<sup>7</sup>

On February 1, 1893, Minister Stevens wrote: "The Hawaiian

.....  
7. Messages and Papers of the Presidents, op. cit., XIII., 5895.



pear is now fully ripe and this is the golden hour for the United States to pluck it." <sup>8</sup> On the same day he issued a proclamation whereby in the name of the United States, he assumed the protection of the Hawaiian Islands and declared that said action was taken pending and subject to negotiations at Washington. The assumption of a protectorate was promptly disavowed by our government but the American flag remained flying over the government building at Honolulu and the forces remained on guard until sometime in April, when the flag was hauled down and the troops recalled by Blount's order.

President Cleveland continued with a brief statement of the occurrences that led to the subversion of the constitutional government of Hawaii in the interests of annexation to the United States which would show the true complexion of the transaction. On Saturday, January 14, 1893, the Queen who had intended to proclaim a new constitution, had renounced the project in deference to the wishes and remonstrances of her cabinet. Taking this as a basis for action citizens of Honolulu numbering from 50 to 100, mostly resident aliens, met in a private office and selected a so-called Committee of Safety, composed .....

8. House Executive Documents, op. cit., 111., 402.



of thirteen persons, of whom seven were foreign subjects, including five Americans. This Committee had nothing less in view than annexation to the United States, and between Saturday, January 14, and Monday the 16th, they were certainly in communication with the American minister. On Monday the Queen and her cabinet made public proclamation that no changes in the constitution would be sought except in the methods provided by that instrument. Still under the auspices of the Committee of Safety, a mass meeting of citizens was held on that day to protest against the Queen's alleged and unlawful proceedings and purposes. The real purpose of this meeting was disguised and they contented themselves with procuring the passage of a resolution denouncing the Queen and empowering the Committee to devise ways and means to secure the permanent maintenance of law and order and the protection of life, liberty, and property in Hawaii. Immediately after this adjournment, the Committee unwilling to take further steps without the cooperation of the United States minister, addressed him a note representing, that the public safety was menaced and that lives and property were in danger. When this was written and delivered the Committee of Safety had neither a man nor a gun at their

.....



command. After its delivery they later requested Stevens not to land the United States forces till next morning. Stevens replied that the troops would be landed whether the Committee were ready or not. Between 4 and 5 o'clock in the afternoon of the 16th, about 160 marines from the U. S. ship Boston were landed. They were supplied with double cartridge belts filled with ammunition and with haversacks and canteens, and were accompanied by the hospital corps with stretchers and medical supplies.

This demonstration, President Cleveland pointed out, upon the soil of Honolulu was of itself an act of war, unless made either by the consent of the government of Hawaii or for the bona fide purpose of protecting the imperiled lives and property of citizens of the United States. There was no pretence of any such purpose nor any such consent. In point of fact the existing government protested against the landing of the marines and there is no basis for the pretense that such forces were landed for the security of American life and property. If they had been landed for this purpose, they would have been stationed in the vicinity of such property so as to protect it, instead of at a considerable distance from the American quarters. Admiral Skerrett of the U. S. navy frankly stated that "the location of the troops was inadvisable if they were landed for the

.....



protection of American citizens, whose residences and places of business, as well as the legation and the consulate, were in a distant part of the city; but the location selected was a wise one if the forces were landed for the purpose of supporting the provisional government.<sup>9</sup> If any peril to life and property had existed, Great Britain and other foreign powers interested would not have been far behind the United States in protecting their citizens. As it was the U. S. marines were the only troops landed at this time. When the marines landed Honolulu was in its customary orderly and peaceful condition, no riot or disturbances was occurring in any quarter. The only peril to anyone grew out of the revolutionary intentions on the part of the Committee of Safety. The Committee knew quite certainly what would follow their unsupported attempt to overthrow the government of the Queen.<sup>10</sup>

Thus it appears that Hawaii was taken possession of by the United States forces without the consent or wish of any officer of the government of the Islands, or of anybody else except the United States minister. Therefore, the military occupation of Honolulu by the United States on the day mentioned was wholly without justification, either as occupation by consent or as an .....

9. House Executive Documents, op. cit., III., 527.

10. Messages and Papers of the Presidents, op. cit., XIII., 5898.



occupation necessitated by danger threatening American life and property. This act of aggression must therefore, be accounted for in some other way, and Cleveland intimated that the real motive was neither obscure nor far to seek.<sup>11</sup>

The United States forces being now on the scene and favorably stationed, the Committee of Safety proceeded to carry out their original scheme. They met the next morning, Tuesday, the 17th, perfected the plan of temporary government and fixed upon it principal officers, ten of whom were drawn from the thirteen members of the Committee of Safety. Having first taken the precaution of ascertaining whether there was anyone there to oppose them, they set out for the government building by different routes to avoid notice and there they proceeded to proclaim the new government between one and two o'clock. An American citizen began to read the proclamation from the steps of the government building, almost entirely without auditors. Before the reading was finished, however, groups of people, estimated at from 50 to 100, some armed and others unarmed, gathered about the Committee. Most important of all the United States marines were drawn up under arms and with artillery in readiness only 76 yards distant, and they dominated the situation.

.....

11. Messages and Papers of the Presidents, op.cit., XIII., 5899.



The provisional government, President Cleveland pointed out, was proclaimed "to exist until terms of union with the United States had been negotiated and agreed upon." The United States minister recognized this government within an hour after the reading of the proclamation, and before five o'clock and upon inquiry on behalf of the Queen and her cabinet, he formally announced that he had done so.

The only basis upon which the provisional government rested he concluded, was the fact that the Committee of Safety had declared it to exist. It was neither a government *de facto* nor *de jure*. To be entitled to recognition it should have been in possession of the government property and agencies. The Committee of Safety were not in possession of the palace, the barracks, nor the police station where there were at least 500 fully armed men and several pieces of artillery.

If the Queen could have dealt with the insurgents alone, President Cleveland concluded, she could easily have put down the rebellion. But the United States had allied itself with her enemies, and had recognized them as the true government of Hawaii. She could not withstand the power of the United States, but she believed she could trust to its justice. Therefore, she yielded her authority under protest only until such time as the United

.....



States upon the facts presented to it, should undo the action of its representatives and reinstate her in the authority she claimed as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands. Though this protest was delivered to the chief of the provisional government, who endorsed thereon his acknowledgement of its receipt, yet the provisional government with this unanswered protest in its hand, hastened to negotiate with the United States for the permanent banishment of the Queen from power.

In summing up his case at this point President Cleveland stated that he believed that a candid and thorough examination of the facts will force the conviction that the provisional government owed its existence to an armed invasion by the United States. Fair minded people, with the evidence before them, would hardly claim that the Hawaiian government was overthrown by the people of the islands or that the provisional government had ever existed with their consent. Neither could it be claimed that the people would uphold it if they were allowed to vote on the question. The lawful government of Hawaii was thus overthrown without the drawing of a sword or the firing of a shot by a process every step of which was directly traceable to and dependent for its success upon the agency of the United States acting thru its diplomatic and naval representatives. Undoubt-  
.....



edly, if the United States minister had not favored annexation the Committee of Safety would never have existed.<sup>12</sup>

But for the landing of the United States forces upon false pretexts respecting the danger to American life and property, the Committee would never have exposed themselves to the pains and penalties of treason by undertaking the subversion of the Queen's government, nor would they have proclaimed the provisional government from the steps of the government building. If it had not been for the United States forces, and Minister Stevens' recognition of the Provisional government, the Queen and her government would never have yielded to the provisional government, even for a time and for the sole purpose of submitting her case to the enlightened justice of the United States. Our country was now in danger of holding the position of having actually set up a temporary government on foreign soil by force for the purpose of acquiring thru that agency territory from which we had wrongfully driven the lawful government.<sup>13</sup>

Believing, therefore, that the United States could not under these circumstances annex the islands, President Cleveland announced that he would not again submit the treaty of annexation .....

12. Messages and Papers of the Presidents, op. cit., XIII., 5901.

13. Ibid., XIII., 5901.



to the Senate for its consideration and he had instructed Minister Willis to so inform the provisional government. Willis was also to advise the Queen and her supporters of the President's desire to aid in the restoration of the status existing before the lawless landing of the United States forces at Honolulu on the 16th of January last, if such restoration could be effected upon terms providing for clemency as well as justice to all parties concerned. The conditions suggested contemplated a general amnesty to those concerned in setting up the provisional government. In short, it was required that the past should be buried and that the restored government should reassume its authority as if it had not been interrupted.

In closing President Cleveland said that these conditions have not proved acceptable to the Queen. Though she has been informed that they will be insisted upon and that unless acceded to the efforts of the President to aid in the restoration of her government would cease, it has not thus far been learned that she was willing to agree. This check upon President's plan has prevented their presentation to the members of the provisional government, while unfortunate public misrepresentations have obviously injured the prospects for a successful Executive mediation. He was willing, however, to cooperate in any legislative

.....



plan which could be devised for the solution of the problem  
which would be consistant with American honor, integrity, and  
morality.<sup>14</sup>

.....

14. Messages and Papers of the Presidents, op. cit., XIII.,  
5904.



## CHAPTER III

On December 6, 1893, a resolution was introduced in the House by Hitt of Illinois, which read as follows:

"Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to this House, if not inconsistent with the public interest, copies of the instructions given to the representative of the United States now in the Hawaiian Islands in regard to the protection of the lives and property of American citizens there, or any contemplated change in the form of government."

It was referred to the committee on Foreign Relations, who reported it back to the House on December 13, 1893, with the amendment, "and all correspondence since the 4th day of March, 1889, in regard to Hawaii, not before transmitted to congress."<sup>1</sup> The resolution with the amendment was passed the same day.

On December 18, 1893, President Cleveland complied with the request and transmitted to the House the instructions and correspondence asked for.<sup>2</sup>

After the correspondence had been read in the House Boutelle of Maine offered following resolution:

"Whereas the executive communications just read to the House clearly disclose that the rights and dignity of the House of Representatives as a coordinate branch of the congress of the United States have been invaded by the executive department in furnish-  
.....

1. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 1, 374.
2. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 1, 82.



ing secret instructions to a minister plenipotentiary of the United States to conspire with the representatives of a deposed and discredited monarchy for the subversion and overthrow of the established republican government to which he was accredited and to which public instructions pledged the good faith and sympathy of the President, the government, and the people of the United States: therefore, Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that any intervention by the Executive of the United States, its civil or military representatives, without authority of congress, in the internal affairs of a friendly, recognized government to disturb or overthrow it and to aid or abet the substitution or restoration of a monarchy therefor, is contrary to the policy and traditions of the Republic and the letter and spirit of the Constitution and can not be too promptly or emphatically reprobated.<sup>3</sup>"

It was referred without debate to the committee of Foreign Relations, December 19, 1893.

Hitt from Illinois, introduced following resolution after the reading of correspondence submitted by the President on December 18: "Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to the House of Representatives, if not inconsistent with the public interests, all information received since his message of December 18, 1893, or not transmitted therewith and now in his .....

3. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 1, 398.



possession, touching recent reported events in the Hawaiian Islands, any attempt to overthrow the republican government thereof and erect a monarchy in its stead, and especially whether any representative, officer, vessel, or armed forces of the United States took part in such recent attempts to subvert a friendly government, and if so, by whose orders they acted."

This resolution was also referred to the committee on Foreign Relations without debate.

On January 3, 1894, the committee to whom Kitt's House resolution relating to intervention of United States in affairs in Hawaii and Boutelle's resolution on the same subject, reported back that the resolutions had been considered and recommended that they be laid on the table and that the following resolution be considered in lieu thereof:

"Resolved: First that it is the sense of this House that the action of the United States minister in employing the United States naval forces and illegally aiding in overthrowing the constitutional government of the Hawaiian Islands in January, 1893, and in setting up in its place a provisional government not republican in form and in opposition to the will of the majority of the people, was contrary to the traditions of our Republic and the spirit of our constitution, and should be and is condemned.

Second, That we heartily approve the principle announced by the President of the United States, that interference in the domestic affairs of an independent nation is contrary to the spirit of American institutions. And it is further the sense of .....



this House that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to our country, or the assumption of a protectorate over them by our government, is uncalled for and inexpedient; that the people of that country should have absolute freedom and independence in pursuing their own line of policy, and that foreign intervention in the political affairs of the islands will not be regarded with indifference by the government of the United States." <sup>4</sup>

Before the debate on this resolution commenced, Hitt of Illinois, asked permission to offer a substitute to the above resolution so that they could have it before them when they debated. Permission was granted. The substitute reads as follows:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that the demand caused by the President of the United States by his imperative instructions to be made on the 19th of December last upon the President and officers of the Hawaiian government, that it promptly relinquish all authority, and his proposed erection of a monarchy in its stead, was an unwarranted intervention in the affairs of a friendly recognized government, contrary to the law of this Republic, and the spirit of the constitution.

Resolved, That the provisional government of Hawaii having been duly recognized, the highest international interests require that it shall pursue its own line of polity; and foreign intervention in the political affairs of these islands will be regarded-

.....

4. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1814.



ed as an act unfriendly to the government of the United States."<sup>5</sup>

The House debated the Hawaiian question for several weeks. Boutelle of Maine, Hitt of Illinois, Blair of New Hampshire, Morse of Massachusetts, Johnson of Indiana, all Republicans, were opposed to the administration, while McCreary of Kentucky, Oates of Alabama, Patterson of Tennessee, Money of Mississippi, and others, all Democrats, were in favor of the Administration's policy.

In their debate the Republicans attacked the resolution brought in by the committee of foreign relations. They held that the resolution declared that it was inexpedient for the United States either to annex the Hawaiian Islands or to establish a protectorate over them. In other words they argued that the Democrats were avoiding the real issue by attempting to fasten odium upon a United States minister to avoid the real point at issue. They insisted that the debate centered about the actions of the present administration in its relation to the Hawaiian Islands. They argued that the administration had sought to invest its official purpose in the Hawaiian matter with secrecy and mystery, and had ignored the legislative branch<sup>6</sup> of the government which it was its duty to consult.

.....

5. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1814.

6. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 2, 1881.



In answer the Democrats asked the House to note the fact that during the former administration, not one word was communicated to the American House of Representatives of all the proceedings that were taking place in regard to annexation. So that if the few days that intervened after the administration at present in power was preparing itself to deal with this question amounted to a lack of confidence, what may be said of the previous administration, whose archives bristled all thru with proof of every step that had been taken in the negotiations, and not one word of which had ever been communicated to this House or to the American people. On the contrary when this treaty and the accompanying documents made here and in Honolulu were sent to the Senate of the United States, they were sent under the seal of secrecy. Therefore, we may well claim that the first public disclosure made in this behalf was made by the present President of the United States. He is the first official who took the American people into his confidence.<sup>7</sup>

The Democrats also claimed that the statement that the President had ignored the legislative branch of the government which it was his duty to consult was false, as there was no constitutional right embodied in this House to share, at the time of their occurrence, in diplomatic negotiations. From the time .....

7. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1899.



that Washington sent his ministers abroad until today, the one branch of this government that has a right to deal with executive affairs of this kind has been the Senate, not the House. It is not a breach of privilege that executive communications are kept for a long time under seal of executive secrecy. This resolution which states, "Whereas the executive communications just read to this House clearly discloses that the rights of the House of Representatives as a coordinate branch of the congress of the United States has been invaded by the Executive department--," and so on, recites as a matter of law a thing which is not the law; and it is not to be believed that anybody would willingly vote for a false statement of the law. No one can expect this House to pass a resolution which is false in its recital of facts.<sup>8</sup>

The Republicans also claimed that Cleveland had sent a so styled commissioner with paramount power to investigate the Hawaiian question, and that he had later sent a minister to a friendly de facto government with secret instructions to conspire for its overthrow and destruction and demand that it surrender to a barbarous Queen.<sup>9</sup>

.....

8. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1899.  
 9. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 2, 1882.



This was done without the consent of the Senate and in violation of the spirit and letter of the constitution.

The Democrats held that the conspiracy organized in Hawaii can not be excused by abuse of Blount. As Blount was very well known in Washington he needed no indorsement. The constitutional right of the President to appoint Blount a special commissioner had also been assailed, but his appointment has several hundred precedents. He was not an ambassador or a public minister under the constitution, he was an agent appointed for a specific purpose, and when that purpose was accomplished there was an end to the agency. In the year 1818 the right of the President to appoint special commissioners to the South American states was questioned by Clay when the diplomatic appropriation bill came up in the House. The objection was met by placing the appropriation under the head of incidental expenses. Since then, if you except the differences of opinion that arose in the Senate committee when the treaty with Great Britain was under consideration, the right of the President to appoint special commissioners to take testimony and report the result of their investigation has never been questioned or denied.

When Blount had reported the result of his investigation to the State department the President appointed Willies minister to .....

10. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1829.



Hawaii and accredited him to the provisional government. He was not instructed to conspire for the overthrow and destruction of the provisional government as is proved by his instructions which has been sent to the House. He was only to lend his friendly services and if the Queen agreed to certain conditions, among them general amnesty, the provisional government would be called upon to restore the government to the Queen. This was no more than right if our former minister had helped to dethrone her.

The opposition claimed that the allegations against Stevens were not true. That they had been denied by the press of the nation, and were not believed by the people. The evidence against him was largely dependent on Blount's report for support. The report was prejudiced and much of its evidence had been given in response to leading questions with no chance for cross examination of witnesses, nor were the men who were assailed given any chance to testify in their own defence. Stevens did favor annexation but this falls short of establishing the fact that he aided in the revolution which put the provisional government in power. He landed the troops for the protection of life and property, but they did not take part in the revolution. When he recognized the provisional government they had an armed force at their command and in possession of all the government buildings except possibly

.....



the police station, while the Queen was powerless to resist the  
 11  
 revolution.

The Democrats held that Stevens was the central figure, the chief actor, and all that had been proposed by this administration was in consequence of his acts, which were in violation of the law of the nations, and in violation of his general instructions.  
 12 He worked for annexation and landed troops which aided in the overthrow of the government. What was more, he willfully and deliberately misrepresented the facts of the case to his government and that he stood convicted of having used his position as a representative to deceive the administration from whom he received his appointment. He told the Secretary of State that no recognition was accorded to the provisional government by the United States minister until after the Queen's abdication, when they were in effective possession of the government building, archives, treasury, and all the potential machinery of the government. Also in the Hawaiian commissioners' reply to the Queen's protest, written by Thurston, February 11, 1893, he said that at the time the provisional government took possession of the government buildings no American troops or officers were  
 .....

11. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1883.

12. Ibid., XXVI., pt.2, 1838.



present or took part in such proceedings in any manner whatever. No public recognition was accorded the provisional government by the American minister until they were in possession of the government buildings, the archives, and the treasury, supported by several hundred armed men, and after the abdication of the Queen and the surrender to the provisional government of her forces. Both Stevens and Thurston knew these statements were false. His statements were also contradicted by Dole's letter to the American minister in which he acknowledged the receipt of Stevens' communication recognizing the provisional government, but stating that they were not yet in possession of the station house and the barracks. As night was approaching and he was afraid their forces were insufficient to maintain order, he requested the immediate support of the United States forces and that their commander<sup>13</sup> would also take charge of the Hawaiian forces.

Of course Stevens was guilty of no act of violence. The marines were landed with their guns and took position within seventy-six yards of the government building, and they did intimidate the Queen and her forces. She knew that if the United States marines were molested, the war ship Boston was lying in the harbor.....

13. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1894.



ber and could destroy the city. So while there was no physical force employed there was intimidation, which is quite the equivalent of force in many instances.

The Democrats further argued that Blount's report proved that the Hawaiian government was overthrown and the Dole oligarchy set up thru the aid of the United States minister and the United States naval forces at Honolulu. The revolution would not have been successful but for that aid. The report states that Stevens consulted freely with the leaders of the revolutionary movement from the evening of the 14th, and learned from them all their plans. They feared arrest and punishment, but he promised them protection. It was arranged between them and the American minister that the proclamation dethroning the Queen and organizing a provisional government should be read from the government building and he would follow it with a speedy recognition. All this was to be done with American troops, provided with small arms and artillery, across a narrow street within a stone's throw of the government building. Otherwise the leaders of the revolutionary movement would not have attempted the undertaking. But for this their mass meeting would not have held, and no request to land troops would have been made. It was only too evident that the American minister and the re-  
.....

14. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1892.



revolutionary leaders had determined on a new addition to the United States and had agreed on the part each was to act to the  
 15  
 very end.

The Democrats also pointed out that Stevens had pretended that he landed the troops and guns to protect the life and property of Americans. This was another of those remarkable statements by which he deceived Secretary Foster. While American citizens and their property were to be found in Honolulu, they were not near the government building. Some of their property was near the wharves, and American citizens were to be found only in the residence part of the city. He stationed the United States marines and guns at a considerable distance from the wharves and business streets and far away from the residence quarter. They were carefully placed between the palace and the government building in such a way as to command both of these and nothing else. They were excellently posted to overawe, and if necessary to disperse, the government officers and forces, and to support by their presence the hasty reading of the proclamation by the conspirators. The Democrats challenged anyone to point out any case of a single American citizen whose life and property had been in danger during this affair. The citizens walked the streets unarmed as usual up to the time martial .....

15. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1821.



law was proclaimed. A Japanese man-of-war was in the harbor at the time. If the occasion had required it the Japanese minister could also have called for troops.

16

The Democrats stated that Foster had accepted the statements of the United States minister, and the statements of the commission headed by Thurston as truthful. These gentlemen assured the Secretary of State that no recognition had been asked of the United States minister until after the "surrender of all the military and police forces, thereby coming into full possession of the kingdom." Foster took these statements as having been made in good faith and made them the basis of his action. He knew nothing of the letter from Dole in which that functionary acknowledged receipt of Stevens' letter recognizing the de facto government and stating that they were not in possession of the police station and the barracks.

17

The fact, as shown by subsequent testimony, as well as by the letter of Dole, was that many hours after the recognition of the provisional government by Stevens' the head of that government was appealing for support because the Queen's forces had not yielded to their demand. Several hours after the recognition of the provisional government by Stevens, and after repeated efforts on the part of emissaries of the provisional government with the representatives of the

.....

16. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1821.

17. That does not excuse Foster, however, as he knew from other sources that the provisional government was recognized before it was a de facto government. The Queen's protest should at least have aroused his suspicion that everything was not as it should be.



Queen to secure a solution of the difficulty without blood shed, the surrender of the Queen's forces was made under protest and until such time as the United States could pass judgment upon it. It was distinctly stated that she yielded to avoid any collision of armed forces. She yielded while the forces of the United States were so placed as to command absolutely all of the government buildings, but no attention was paid to this protest either by the provisional government or by the American Executive department.<sup>18</sup>

The Democrats further held that the sole claim upon which the landing of the troops is defended was that they were necessary to protect the citizens in the residence portion of the town, but that it had been proved that the troops were not so posted as to have been effective in case of outbreaks in those sections. That the opposition claimed that their very presence in the city had the effect of subduing the lawless elements, and that they were looked upon as a part of the United States forces and therefore not to be attacked. The same arguments may be applied to the effect of those troops upon the Queen and her forces. The Queen's government realized as well as any possible mob that the marines landed from the Boston were a part of the United States forces. Therefore, it is clear that force was used by the con-  
.....

18. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1896.



spirators prior to the Queen's surrender. If the military force far away from the residence district over awed possible disturbers there, was there any reason to suppose the influence of the 19 marines was not felt by the Queen in the government square.

In summing up the main facts in the matter, we find that the Queen threatened to proclaim a new constitution. Her ministers refused to join her in that proclamation with the result that she abandoned the attempt and so notified Minister Stevens. On Monday, January 16, two or three thousand Hawaiian citizens, in sympathy with the government of the Queen, peacefully convened in mass meeting and declared their allegiance to her and to her government and their confidence in her good intentions. At 2 o'clock on the same day another meeting was called by the junta of 13, at which the Queen was denounced, but no intimation was given of any purpose to establish a provisional government. Before that meeting was called the evidence discloses the fact that the junta had a perfect understanding with the American minister that he would protect them and would land troops whenever they would request him to do so. In less than an hour, after this meeting was held, these conspirators requested Stevens to land troops in Honolulu for the ostensible purpose of protecting life and property, but for the real purpose of protecting them .....



in their revolutionary designs. On the same evening at 5 o'clock, the marines, fully armed and equipped with Gatling guns, invaded the city of Honolulu, took possession, and hoisted the American flag. At the time this occurrence took place, all was peace in the city. Men, women, and children were on the streets peacefully passing to and fro without any suspicion of danger. That night this junta, everyone of whom was a foreigner, or of foreign origin, met in a building adjoining the residence of the American minister, and there secretly unfolded their scheme for the organization of a provisional government. This was to be proclaimed on the following day. Ten of their number were designated as officers of the proposed government. They did this with the understanding and in pursuance of a previously arranged plan made with the American minister to the effect that if they would the next day occupy the public building, and there read the proclamation and establish a provisional government, he, the American minister, would recognize it as the de facto government of Hawaii. Up to this time the deliberation and purposes of the junta were kept secret from the public. The next day they sent a man named Wilcox to the government building to survey the field and to see whether their motives and purposes were known or

.....

CONFIDENTIAL



suspected, and to report whether they could in safety approach and enter that building without being arrested. When it was ascertained that the building was comparatively vacant and no one suspected what was going on, this junta, the Committee of Safety, divided up into small parties went leisurely to the public building, so that peaceful citizens would not suspect their intention. Once there, one of their numbers proceeded to read the proclamation establishing the provisional government. So unsuspecting was the general public that not more than four or five were present when the reading began.

The Democrats described the situation at the place where the new government was proclaimed as being most significant. West of the government building were the marines, the Gatling guns, and the flag of the United States overhead. Within 400 yards was the Queen's palace, where were stationed 50 of her troops. Within 200 yards of the palace were the barracks, in which 272 soldiers of the Queen were stationed. At the station house within 400 yards were 224 other soldiers of the Queen. At the time that the proclamation was read an army of 546 soldiers, loyal to the Queen and under command of an efficient officer, were within gunshot range of the spot at which the proclamation was then being read. But the marines were so stationed that the Queen's troops could not fire upon the conspirators .....

20. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1890.



without firing on the flag of the United States. The evidence showed that before 5 o'clock on January 17, 1893, while the Queen was in full possession of her palace, the barracks, and the station house, and supported by an army of 546 men, our accredited minister to Hawaii deliberately recognized the provisional government as the de facto government of the islands. Subsequent to this recognition the commander of her troops preemptorily refused to surrender to the provisional government without instructions from the Queen. Later on that evening Damon, vice-president of the provisional government, in company with members of the Queen's cabinet, insisted that the Queen should surrender to the provisional government and refer her claims to the government of the United States. She consented, and entered a solemn protest declaring that she yielded to "the superior force of the United States whose minister plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, had caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu, and who had declared that he would support said provisional government." Under these conditions the commander of her forces capitulated.<sup>21</sup>

The Democrats offered proof that nearly one year before the eventful period when he hoisted the United States flag at Honolulu .....



and proclaimed a protectorate, Minister Stevens was studying annexation quite as closely as he was his diplomatic duties. As far back as the 8th of March, 1892, in a letter addressed to the Secretary of State, after referring to the possibility that the existing government of Hawaii might be overturned by an orderly and peaceful revolution he said: "I desire to know how far the present minister and naval commander may deviate from established international rules and precedents in the contingency indicated in the first part of this dispatch."<sup>22</sup>

On November 19, 1892, he again wrote to the State department elaborating on the idea of annexation. He finally wrote to the Secretary of State on February 1, 1893: "The Hawaiian pear is now fully ripe, and this is the golden hour to pluck it."<sup>23</sup>

The Democrats considered that they had shown the conduct of ex-Minister Stevens in its proper light and had helped to make clear that annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to our country or the assumption of a protectorate over them by our government was uncalled for and inexpedient and that the people of that country should have absolute freedom and independence in .....

22. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1890.

23. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 2, 1893.



managing their own domestic affairs. That the flag of this country had always been the emblem of liberty, of justice, and of honor. We should not let this opportunity pass to rebuke a minister who has made it the emblem of intrigue, lawlessness, and violated duty.<sup>24</sup>

The Republicans continued to argue that Cleveland had attempted to overthrow a republic and re-establish a monarchy in the Hawaiian Islands. That he intended to put back on the throne a black, half-savage, ignorant, immoral queen by menace and by force and he desired the partial and one-sided evidence collected by Blount that he might utilize it in vindication of such a policy. They went on to explain that the Queen was a native and had inherited all the vices of her ancestors. In her private life she was essentially a savage, in public life she was a tyrant and a despot.<sup>25</sup>

This point was easily disposed of by the Democrats. They held that the defenders of the provisional government claimed that an attempt had been made by President Cleveland to overthrow a republic and reestablish a monarchy in the Hawaiian Islands. The Democrats would like to know when the republic was established. The provisional government did not possess any of .....

24. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1822.

25. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 2, 1883.



the attributes of a republic. No opportunity had ever been offered the people of that country to declare their wishes in the matter. In all the papers submitted by the friends of the provisional government there was not one line indicating even the intention of establishing a republic. There was a plan outlined by the Committee of Safety, who possessed no shadow of authority from the people of the country, who sought to deliver the islands over to the United States under a treaty. The people of the Hawaiian Islands had not made this treaty for they had never been consulted. The sole authority now, as it was a year ago, rests with the men who seized the government of the islands  
26  
with no shadow of right.

They further pointed out that, in the light of what has been claimed by those who established the provisional government, some articles in the treaty are very remarkable. If the Queen was rightfully deposed and the constitutional government of Hawaii was justly overthrown and had no legal existence, why was a provision put in the treaty for the benefit of the Queen? Why should the United States pay her an annuity? And if the young princess had no rights and the monarchical government of Hawaii was dead, why did the treaty provide that she also should be paid by the tax-payers of the United States the sum of

.....

26. Congressional Record, op. cit., pt. 2, 1896.



\$150,000? On what ground could any representative in congress justify the payment of three and a quarter millions of dollars by the tax-payers of the United States to satisfy the public debt of Hawaii, and also the amounts due to depositors in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank. The hysterics of some persons in regard to protecting a monarchy or destroying a republic were wholly unnecessary. No republic had been organized or had been attempted to be organized in Hawaii, and therefore, no effort had been made or could be made to overthrow it. The provisional government was to exist only until terms of union with the United States had been negotiated and agreed upon.<sup>27</sup>

The Democrats held that one point which the Republicans stressed was a matter entirely irrelevant in this debate, namely, in personal character of the Queen. What had that to do with the violations of the rights of Hawaii, an independent sovereignty. Some hard necessity must have compelled the opposition to descend so low as to bring her character into this debate and assail it with epithets. To charge the President with favoring a monarchy was nothing but slander. The insinuations made against the President were merely for the purpose of prejudicing him in public estimation, and to make his administration unpopular. The .....

27. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1819.



President had but one question presented to him, did our government do a wrong? believing that it did, he had tried his best to right that wrong. He found that the United States forces were illegally used to intimidate the Queen and aided by their presence the cause of the revolutionists. Whether the revolutionists were right or wrong, did not enter this debate and with that our government had no concern. Cleveland had justly repudiated these acts of the minister, and the House resolutions supporting him in this stand ought to be adopted without a dissenting vote. <sup>28</sup>

The Democrats claimed that the President's messages with the accompanying correspondence presented a clear and satisfactory exposition of the situation. His offer of friendly mediation in the interest of peace and justice having failed because of the refractoriness of both the dethroned Queen and the provisional government, he had submitted the whole subject to congress. Whatever duplicity, selfishness, or partisanship may have been shown in other quarters during the Hawaiian excitement, it was clear that, in the light of the real facts, and official correspondence, the President stood conspicuous as a courageous and patriotic Chief Magistrate, actuated by the highest sense of honor and fairness, and prompted by an earnest desire to do justice to the .....

28. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1892.



people of our own great country. That the facts shown fully justify the President in his course. It was right that he withdrew the treaty which had been put before the Senate upon a false statement of facts. It was right that he sent as commissioner to Hawaii a gentleman of spotless character to investigate the matter and put the true relation of all these occurrences before the American people and before congress. There was not a single fact to prove what had been charged that he meditated to replace the Queen on her throne by force of arms. Both Blount's and Willis' instructions were before the House, and Blount had also said he had assured the people of Hawaii over and over again that there would be no intervention of force to reinstate the Queen. Cleveland did what Harrison should have done. The Queen had surrendered, as she states, to the power of the United States, and that surrender had been accepted, with its terms, by the provisional government. This left no choice to Cleveland, he was<sup>29</sup> in duty bound to investigate.

The Republicans suggested that the best policy for this government to follow was to negotiate a suitable treaty with the de facto government in Hawaii and annex the islands. The Queen's rights could be purchased if necessary, but on no account should .....

29. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1842.



the opportunity be neglected of securing this naval and coaling station which was so important to the United States both from the point of commerce and of coast defense. They have been offered to us by both of the parties who claimed to be entitled to them. If the United States did not accept them one of the European powers was likely to, and they would be a menace to our Pacific coast from that time on.

The Democrats answered that careful examination of the facts showed that there certainly were controlling reasons which impelled certain American citizens to desire the overthrow of the constitutional government of the Hawaiian Islands. The provisional government was made up mainly of sugar planters who would be benefited by annexation by receiving the sugar bounty. By the reciprocity treaty of 1876, Hawaiian sugar was permitted to come to the United States free of duty, while other importers of sugar were required to pay a tax of two cents a pound. In the past 16 years the sugar planters of Hawaii, because of this privilege made \$61,000,000, and increased their wealth with a rapidity unparalleled. No talk was heard of annexation then. When the McKinley bill was passed in 1890, making sugar free, Hawaiian sugar had to be sold in the United States in open competition with the sugar of the world, and the Hawaiian sugar planters lost .....

30. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1845.



the two cent bounty per pound which had been given by the McKinley bill to sugar producers in the United States. Immediately the cry went up among the Hawaiian planters for annexation to the United States in order that they might assist in draining annually millions of dollars from the people of the United States under the sugar-bounty clause of the tariff bill. But for the reciprocity treaty, the sugar planters of Hawaii would have paid into the United States treasury \$5,000,000 annually, therefore, we paid them that sum yearly to promote the sugar industry in a foreign country.<sup>31</sup>

The Democrats accused the Republicans of wanting to censure Cleveland for the effect they might be able to get out of it in the next campaign, that they were after the President for political purposes, but the Democrats did not intend that they should get any political capital out of it; that they were out after Stevens and that they both would and ought to get him.<sup>32</sup>

While he was debating the question Blair of New Hampshire offered on February 3, 1894, the following resolution as amendment of Hitt's substitute:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives approves the recognition of the existing provisional government of the

.....

31. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1889.

32. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 2, 1900.



Hawaiian Islands by the last and present administration of this government, and will tend to consummate in the near future, with the consent of their people, the annexation of said islands to this country, or some other political arrangement which will fully preserve and promote the mutual interests of both Hawaii and the United States.<sup>33</sup>

On February 6, 1894, the House was ready to take a vote upon the resolutions offered by the committee on Foreign Relations, the substitute offered by Hitt, and the amendment by Blair.

The vote on the amendment was taken first with the following results:

Number of votes cast, 351. Yeas, 90; Nays, 165; Not voting, 96.

Accordingly the amendment of Blair was rejected.<sup>34</sup> The same day the vote was taken on the substitute offered by Hitt of Illinois with the following results:

Number of votes cast, 351. Yeas, 103; Nays, 159; Not voting, 89.

Therefore the substitute resolution was also rejected.<sup>35</sup> On

February 7, 1894, the vote was taken on the resolution which the committee on Foreign Relations had offered with these results:

Number of votes cast, 351. Yeas, 177; Nays, 78; Not voting, 96.

Therefore this resolution was agreed to.<sup>36</sup> On the same day

.....

33. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 1814.

34. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 2, 1967.

35. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 2, 1968.

36. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 2, 2007.



Boutelle's resolution which had been laid on the table was reported again and voted on with the following results:

Number of votes cast, 351. Yeas, 94; Nays, 158; Not voting, 99.  
37

This resolution was not agreed to.

One Republican William Everett of Massachusetts voted with the Democrats in favor of Cleveland's policy on every measure brought before the House, otherwise Cleveland was supported by a strict party vote. The House of Representatives after debating the Hawaiian question also showed by their vote that they supported Cleveland in his policy.

.....

37. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 2008.



## CHAPTER IV

On December 20, 1893, Senator Morgan of Alabama introduced a resolution into the Senate "that the committee on Foreign Relations shall inquire and report whether any, and, if so, what irregularities have occurred in the diplomatic or other intercourse between the United States and Hawaii, and to this end said committee is authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths to witnesses."<sup>1</sup> The resolution passed the Senate without debate the same day.

A sub-committee composed of five members of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senators Morgan (chairman), Gray, Sherman, Frye, and Butler met on December 27, 1893, to begin the investigation.

The following persons and groups of persons who were in the United States at this time, gave their testimony: Blount, special commissioner sent by Cleveland to conduct the investigation in Hawaii, Stevens, the United States minister to Hawaii at the time the revolution took place, business and professional men from Hawaii, naval officers of the United States navy, and tourists who had been in Hawaii at the time of the revolution.

While the Senate Committee carried on its investigation the whole Hawaiian question was being debated in the Senate. The de-  
.....

1. Congressional Record, 53 Cong., 2nd Sess., XXVI., pt. 1, 61.



bate centered around Cleveland's special message of December 18, 1893, sent to the Senate, together with the correspondence in the State department relating to the question. Senator Hear of Massachusetts, led the opposition, aided by Senators Dolph of Oregon, Davis of Minnesota, and Frye of Maine, all Republicans, while Senators Gray of Delaware, Mills of Texas, Vest of Missouri, and Turpie of Indiana, Democrats, took Cleveland's side on the question.

The opposition held, if what the president implied in his message was true, that because he has concluded there was some wrongful action on the part of our minister under a previous administration in aiding in the establishment of the present government he thinks it is his duty to overthrow it and put another one in power, he is meditating an act of war against Hawaii. The power to declare war is placed under the constitution in the Senate and it is, therefore, entitled to prompt and immediate knowledge of all the facts which bear upon the question. There is no reason why Cleveland should not have communicated to the Senate the fact that he feared the United States had done something wrong, or had made a mistake in the past, and asked for a fit and suitable legislative authority to have the facts ascertained. He also commissioned without the consent of .....



the Senate a person with paramount powers to represent the United States in Hawaii. This is a gross violation of the constitution and no money shall be paid from the Treasury to such persons.<sup>2</sup>

They further argued that the suggestion that the United States may have acted with undue haste in the recognition of the government, or that it may have violated international law by taking part in the revolution that established it did not matter, the government was a fact and not a question of right and wrong, as far as all other governments were concerned. International law recognizes nothing but the fact of government. It has been recognized by all the civilized powers of the world who have international relations with Hawaii.

The Republicans also argued that Cleveland's urging upon the half-barbarous Queen a general amnesty policy was a gross violation of the Hawaiian constitution as she had no legal right to issue pardons, that must be done in conjunction with the cabinet. No reliance could be placed upon her word, however, as she had been in the conspiracy to dethrone her brother and later denied it.<sup>3</sup> Hoar of Massachusetts in his speech made this comment on her character: "It will be remembered that the President of the United States, deeming that it would be a shame, a foul shame, to .....

2. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 1, 129.

3. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 1, 622.



expose the persons who had been engaged in the recent establishment of the present government of Hawaii to the vengeance of a cruel and semibarbarous ruler, demanded from her a complete pardon and amnesty to all persons engaged in that revolution. Nobody, however severe a critic of the present administration, questions the wisdom and humanity of that stipulation. The Queen had many times broken her promises and her oath of office. When the suggestion of amnesty was made to her, she said that she thought the persons ought to be beheaded, their property confiscated, their children driven from the realm, and that she would not consent to any amnesty."<sup>4</sup>

The opposition also claimed that Stevens landed the United States marines purely for the protection of American life and property and that the revolutionists were able to protect themselves as the Queen's government was powerless to stay the revolution in its progress.<sup>5</sup>

Dolph of Oregon suggested an aggressive foreign policy. That the future control of the Hawaiian Islands was a question of national importance, effecting our national safety, the interests of our commerce, the requirements of our navy, and the protection of American citizens. The policy of the United .....

4. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 1, 852.

5. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 1, 628.



States has been not only that the sovereignty of the islands should not pass to any foreign country, but if the islands were to form a political connection with any foreign country it should be with us. Everyone has had a right to believe that while our government would not hasten the revolution in the islands, it would not be the last to recognize revolution accomplished, and would not, when it could honorably do so refuse to accept the sovereignty of the islands.<sup>6</sup>

The Democrats very ably answered the charges brought forth by the Republicans. They argued that the President had been arraigned because he said that the Queen of those islands has been illegally deposed by armed forces of our government, and that she is yet the legitimate Queen in that country, and we are told that he is instituting a monarchy. He is not going to wage war to restore it. He does not claim to have the power to do that as it requires an act of Congress. Whatever power is placed in his hands as an Executive he can and has exercised. He has taken down the flag and put it where it belongs, and removed the marines to where they belong, and has said the Queen was illegally deposed not by her people but by the help of a foreign power wielded in this instance by our accredited minister. The .....

6. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 1, 20.



only thing for us to do is to find out if the United States did take any part in the overthrow of the Hawaiian government. If we did then both honor and justice demand that we make restitution.  
7

The Democrats also claimed that it was the condition of the sugar planting interests upon the islands which provoked the revolution and that annexation began to be the cry of the sugar planters after the first of October, 1890, when the McKinley bill passed and sugar was put upon the free list and Hawaiian interests fell. Their sugar had now to be sold in open competition with the sugar of the world here in the markets of the United States and they lost that two cent bounty that had been given them. Then all at once they cried for annexation to the United States, that they might come in and be part of the territory and citizenship of the United States in order to take \$5,000,000 annually out of the pockets of the people of the United States. The constitution of 1887 with a property qualification of \$3,000 for the nobles and the voters of nobles made it impossible for anyone but the sugar barons to get into the house of nobles and from that time they controlled the government and disfranchised the great body of Hawaiian people. It was this government, against which the Hawaiian people protested, and for the amendment of which the Queen proposed the new constitution. When

.....

7. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 1, 62.



this became known everybody wondered what Stevens would do. It was not long before all knew he was on the side of the insurgents. That settled the question as the Queen's government troops knew<sup>8</sup> they could not fight against the United States.

The Democrats held that the President had done the only honorably thing to do, to try and restore the government to the people from whom it had been taken. He, therefore, sent a special commissioner to gather information, which was a precedent handed down from Washington's time and had never been disputed. As to his pay the secret-service fund voted annually to the State department takes care of that.<sup>9</sup>

That Stevens acted only as the neutral representative of a friendly foreign power was not borne out by the facts of the case. He said he made no response to the letter requesting aid, but he did land the troops fully equipped for active service and they marched under his direction to Arion Hall, a strategic point near the Hawaiian government capitol, where the provisional government entered and took possession the next day. That would not have taken place but for the aid promised by Stevens. At the time Stevens promised aid every principle of international justice required and demanded of Stevens, and of every other foreign representative in Honolulu, that they should not interfere one way .....

8. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 1, 62.

9. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 1, 66.



or the other; yet Stevens selected this very moment to say that he would recognize their government, and that he would support it with troops from the ship Boston. That was an absolute betrayal of his trust. The statement that the new government would have succeeded without this aid is beside the question. This interference without authority did occur, therefore, neither the treaty nor the project of annexation can be favorably considered.<sup>10</sup>

In his Autobiography written some years later Senator Hoar makes this comment upon the party platform which he prepared for the State Convention in 1894. "I ought to explain one phrase 'No barbarous Queen beheading men in Hawaii.' It was currently reported in the press that the Queen of Hawaii, was a semibarbarous person, and that when Blount, Cleveland's commissioner, proposed to restore her government and said that amnesty should be extended to all persons who had taken part in the revolution, she had said with great indignation, 'What, is no one to be beheaded?' and that upon that answer Blount and Cleveland had abandoned any further purpose of using the power of the United States to bring the monarchy back again. That, so far as I knew, had never been contradicted and had obtained general belief.

.....

10. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 1, 707.



I ought not to have accepted the story without investigation. I learned afterward, from undoubted authority, that the Queen is an excellent Christian woman; that she has done her best to reconcile her subjects of her own race to the new order of things; that she thinks it is better for them to be under the power of the United States than under that of any other country, and that they could not have escaped being subjected to some other country if we had not taken them; and that she expended her scanty income in educating and caring for the children of the persons who were about her court who had lost their own resources by the revolution. I have taken occasion, more than once, to express in the Senate my respect for her, and my regret for this mistake.<sup>11</sup>

The Senate Committee having completed their investigation, Chairman Morgan on February 26, 1894, submitted to the Senate a report giving the opinions of the members of the Committee, and also presented the evidence which had been taken before the Committee in the recent revolution in Hawaii and the participation of the diplomatic and military officers of the United States in the affair. The Committee did not feel that it was proper for them to formulate resolutions expressing their views on international law, as they considered it applied to this case. They .....

11. Hear, Autobiography, New York 1903, 11., 265.



merely presented their opinion in writing and Morgan asked leave to submit the report to the Senate. He also stated that the leading propositions in the report had been agreed to by a majority of the Committee. The report was ordered to be printed in  
 12  
 the Congressional Record.

In considering the case as presented by this Committee, there are several points that need special attention. The report holds that the landing of the troops was not an act of war because there was no demonstration of hostilities, and their conduct was as quiet and as respectful as it had been on many previous occasions when they were landed for the purpose of drill and practice. In passing the palace the Queen appeared upon the balcony and the troops respectfully saluted her by presenting arms and flipping the flag, and made no demonstration of any hostile intent.  
 13

But the fact that there was no demonstration of hostilities or the fact that the troops saluted the Queen in passing the palace did not make the landing of the troops lawful. No troops can be landed in a foreign country without the consent of the government of that country unless it is for the bona fide purpose of protecting the lives and property of their own citizens. The United States troops were landed in Honolulu, January 16, 1893,  
 .....

12. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 2, 2408.

13. House Executive Documents, 53 Cong., 2nd Sess., Ser. No. 3224, XXVII., Washington, D. C., 1895, 103.



without the consent of the Hawaiian government and they were not necessary for the protection of American life and property, because Honolulu was in its customary tranquil state, peace and quiet reigning throughout the town.

The Committee also brought out the point that the laws of Hawaii for the protection of life and property were suspended so far as the executive power was concerned and the citizens of the United States and their property rights were without lawful protection. In a country where there is no power of the law to protect the citizens of the United States there can be no law of nations nor any rule of comity that can rightfully prevent our flag from giving shelter to them under the protection of our arms. Therefore, the Committee said it was the right claimed and exercised by all civilized nations, to enter such a country with sovereign authority to assert and protect the rights of its citizens and their property, and to remain there without the invitation of anybody until civil government shall have been established that is adequate in a satisfactory sense, for their  
14  
protection.

Cleveland pointed out, however, that the laws of Hawaii for the protection of life and property were not suspended and that the Queen's government was in full possession of all government departments. The government officials were offering protection

.....

14. House Executive Documents, op. cit., XXVII., 5.



to American property interests at the same time they protested against the landing of the troops. There was no reason why any troops should be landed, as witnesses in Blount's report testified that there was no unusual disturbance of any kind. The people were quietly going about their business and did not even know that a revolution was in progress and were surprised at the landing of the troops and wondered what had brought them on shore.

The report further states that if the Queen, or the people, or both acting in conjunction, had opposed the landing of the troops from the Boston with armed resistance, their invasion would have been an act of war. But when their landing was not opposed by any objection, protest, or resistance the state of war did not supervene, and there was no irregularity or want of authority, to place the troops on shore.

Blount's investigation brought out the fact that two written protests were sent to Minister Stevens protesting against the landing of the troops. One was made by Parker, minister of foreign affairs, and the other by Cleghorn, Governor of Oahu. Parker in his protest calls attention to the fact that troops from the U. S. S. Boston had been landed in the port of Honolulu at 5 o'clock that evening without the request or knowledge of Her Majesty's government. He said the situation did not call for any .....

15. House Executive Documents, op. cit., XXVII., 5.



interference on the part of the United States government and he would like to know upon what authority the action was taken. He also added that any protection that might have been considered necessary for the American legation or for American property interests would have been cheerfully furnished by Her Majesty's government. Cleghorn in his protest also states that the troops had been landed without permission from the proper authorities. That in the past the Hawaiian government had always granted them permission to land for the purpose of drill, but the present landing was different and apparently for the discharge of functions which were distinctly responsible duties of the Hawaiian government. He also called Stevens' attention to the international question involved in the landing of the troops and the grave responsibility which was assumed. These protests were sent to Stevens the same evening as the troops were landed. Stevens, however, delayed answering until the next day and then only said he would do whatever he thought was for the welfare of all concerned.

Morgan also tried to prove that an interregnum existed in the executive government of Hawaii, which was caused by the efforts of the Queen to destroy the constitution of 1887, and by the act of the people in accepting her will for the completed coup d'etat, and, in making that the occasion for supplying the executive de-  
 .....



16

partment of the government with a chief.

An interregnum is the time during which there is a suspension of executive authority either thru a change of government or for any other reason. Witnesses testifying before both the Senate Committee and Blount said that at the time of the landing of the troops the Queen's government was in possession of all government buildings, barracks, and police station and was thus a government both de facto and de jure, and would have been able to cope with the situation if the United States troops had not been landed for the purpose of overawing the Hawaiian government. No interregnum exists in a country where there is both a de facto and a de jure government which is able to offer protection to American citizens as was done in Minister Parker's protest.

The Committee then argued that the Queen had abdicated. Her action in the effort to overturn the constitution of 1887, to which she had sworn obedience and support, had been accepted and treated by a large and powerful body of the people as a violation of her constitutional obligations, revolutionary in its character and purpose and that it amounted to an act of abdication on her part, so far as her powers and the rights of the people under the constitution of 1887 were concerned. The abdication being completed and confirmed by the only authentic expression of the popular will and by the recognition of the supreme court of Hawaii.

.....

16. Senate Reports, op. cit., 11., 4.

17. House Executive Documents, op. cit., XXVII., 9.



There was no evidence of abdication. The fact that the Queen had intended to promulgate a new constitution did not make it a promulgation and, therefore, it did not constitute an abdication. This being the case the Queen was still the executive head of the government. And Blount's report, as well as the Senate report, brings out very clearly the fact that the revolution was not an expression of the popular will. The movement was started by a few of the leading business men of Honolulu. The first meetings, which took place in private offices and houses before the mass meeting on Monday afternoon, January 16, 1893, at the armory, have been variously estimated as being attended by from 50 to 100 people. The mass meeting was only attended by 1260 people. That is a very small part of the population of Honolulu to say nothing of the Hawaiian Islands. At the mass meeting nothing was said about making a change in the government or of dethroning the Queen. The resolutions passed only denounced the action of the Queen and empowered the Committee to devise "such ways and means as may be necessary to secure the permanent maintenance of law and order, and the protection of life, liberty, and property in Hawaii."<sup>18</sup> If the Committee had mentioned that they intended to depose the Queen and change the government no doubt objections would have been made. The fact that it did not spread beyond the Island of Oahu proves that it was not a popular uprising. In reality it did not go beyond the city of Honolulu and so could not have been an expression of the popular will.

.....

18. House Executive Documents, op. cit., III., 786.



In commenting upon the two meetings held on Monday, January 16, the Senate Committee's report states that they were conducted by the people who arrayed themselves on the side of the Queen on the one hand and those who were organized in opposition to her revolutionary purposes on the other, that when these meetings dispersed, the Queen's effort to reject the constitution of 1887 had been approved by the one meeting held on the palace ground and composed almost entirely of native Kanakas; the other meeting had resolved to establish a provisional government, and formed a committee to proceed with its organization.<sup>19</sup>

Blount's investigation brought out, however, that the people who attended these meetings were only a very small part of the people of Honolulu, the people in the other parts of the kingdom, as before stated, were ignorant of the fact that a revolution was in progress; that the meeting in the armory did not resolve to establish a provisional government, as it was called only for the purpose of protesting against the revolutionary aggressions of the Queen. Speeches were made but no reference was made to a change in government or of the intention to dethrone the Queen. Resolutions were passed but they only denounced the action of the Queen and further empowered the committee to devise such ways and means as may be necessary to secure the permanent maintenance of law and order, and the protection of life, liberty, and property in Hawaii. This proves that it was not the people at the mass

.....

19. House Executive Documents, op. cit., XXVII., 9.



meeting held on Monday afternoon that decided on a change of government but that it was the so called committee of safety, composed of thirteen members, who maneuvered the whole revolutionary movement.

Morgan's report held that the location of the troops was immaterial because the Queen having abdicated an interregnum existed and therefore it was the right as well as the duty of Minister Stevens to land troops and place them in any position where he<sup>20</sup> thought it was necessary.

It seems reasonable to expect that troops used for protection should be located somewhere near the life and property they are to protect. Cleveland pointed out the fact that the United States troops were not favorably located if they were to be used for the protection of American life and property. They were quartered at Arion Hall about 75 yards west of the Hawaiian government building and in direct line with the palace which was about 350 yards to the north. If they were intended for the protection of American life and property they should have been stationed near the American quarters which were in another part of the town and not stationed near the Hawaiian government building and palace. Admiral Skerrett frankly stated that "the location of the troops was inadvisable if they were landed for the protection of American citizens, whose residences and places of business, as well as the legation and the consulate, were in a distant part of the city;

.....

20. Senate Reports, op. cit., II., 6.



but the location selected was a wise one if the forces were landed  
 for the purpose of supporting the provisional government."<sup>21</sup>

The argument was also made by the Senate Committee that the revolution would have taken place just the same if the United States troops had not been present.

Several witnesses in Blount's report testified that if it had not been for the troops in the immediate vicinity the provisional government would never have been proclaimed. The Committee of Safety had taken an inventory of the guns which could be used by the revolutionists, but they had not been collected and no army had been organized. The volunteers were to gather at 2:30, January 17, at the armory and march to the government building, but the ones who were to proclaim the new government could not very well depend on them as they could not be sure if they would be there or not. However, they wanted the volunteers there so that they could say that they had their own army. But they never would have proclaimed a new government if those had been the only troops they had to depend on for protection. The fact that they depended on the United States troops was brought out clearly by several witnesses in their testimony. Soper who was made commander of the provisional troops did not want to accept the command before he was assured that Stevens had promised to aid them by landing the troops and by recognizing the government as soon as they should  
 .....

21. House Executive Documents, op. cit., III., 538.



be in possession of the government building.

The Committee also held that the diplomatic representative of the United States had not promoted the change in government in Hawaii. The diplomatic officers of the United States in Hawaii have the right to much larger liberty of action in respect to the internal affairs of that country than would be the case with any other country with which we have no special relations.<sup>22</sup>

Cleveland, however, proved that Stevens promoted the change of government in Hawaii. Stevens' correspondence with the State Department shows clearly that he was very much interested in the annexation of Hawaii to the United States. During the investigation it was brought out very plainly that the revolutionists would never have dared to overthrow the constitutional government if they had not been sure that Stevens would aid them by landing the troops and by recognizing their government before it was a *de facto* government. Of course in all his official correspondence he was careful to say that the troops would be landed for the protection of American life and property, but the leaders of the revolution understood unofficially that he would give assistance and that he was interested in the undertaking.

Morgan stated that Stevens' recognition of the provisional government was lawful because it was the only government in existence at the time and has continued without interruption or modification.....

22. Senate Reports, op. cit., II., 20.



23

cation up to the present time.

But both investigations, the Senate and Blount's, found that Stevens had recognized the provisional government some time between 3 and 5 o'clock on January 17, and the Queen's abdication under protest was made about 7:30 the same evening. At the time Stevens recognized the provisional government the Queen's government was still in existence and in possession of the palace, barracks, and police station, with the army at her command. The provisional government on the other hand was only in possession of the government building and still Stevens recognized it as a *de facto* government. International law demands that before a government is entitled to be recognized as a *de facto* government it must be in possession of all government property and agencies. As has been stated the provisional government was not in possession of the palace, barracks, and police station, therefore, it was not a *de facto* government and Steven's recognition of it was unlawful. If the provisional government was a *de facto* government, why ask for the protection of the United States troops? The request for aid acknowledged their want of power to sustain themselves and was in itself an admission that they were helpless without the aid and protection of the United States troops. The common opinion of a revolution is that its promoters must have the power to protect themselves and their adherents and to be able to discharge all the ordinary functions of government for the security of life and pro-

.....

23. Senate Reports, op. cit., II., 23.



perty otherwise they have no right to start a revolution for the overthrow of the existing government. The Committee of Safety overthrew the constitutional government of Hawaii and set up a provisional government without the power to protect either themselves or their adherents. This is proved by the fact that as early as January 16, they sent a request to Minister Stevens asking for the protection of the United States admitting that "we are unable to protect ourselves without aid and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces."<sup>24</sup> This is an open admission of their inability to protect either themselves or their adherents from the dangers which might arise thru the opposition of the Queen's forces or any other opposition.

The revolutionists knew before they started that they could never hope to be successful without the help of the U. S. marines, but they also knew that their request for assistance would be granted. The investigation brought out the fact that the circumstance of the landing of the marines was generally accepted as part of the scheme of the revolutionists as understood to be arranged between them and Stevens and Captain Wiltse, of the U. S. steamer Boston. Stevens stated in a letter to the Secretary of State that there were not men enough opposed to the Queen either to overthrow her government or to maintain a government if one were established for them. This was confirmed by the Hawaiian

.....

24. House Executive Documents, op. cit., XXVII., 35.



commissioners to the United States who stated that "there was no longer any possibility of efficiently and permanently maintaining the public peace and the protection of life, liberty, and property in Hawaii under the existing system of government, and that the only method of maintaining such permanent peace and security was by securing the assistance and support of the government of the United States, or of some foreign power, possessed of sufficient force to prevent the future possibility of revolution or despotic assumption of power in derogation of the rights of the people."<sup>25</sup> This confessed the inability of the revolutionists to ever maintain a proper government. For that reason they also asked Stevens on February 1, 1893, to declare a protectorate and raise the flag of the United States, because they were unable to satisfactorily protect life and property and to prevent civil disorders in Honolulu and throughout the Hawaiian Islands.

The report held that the precise hour when or the conditions under which the American minister recognized the provisional government was not a matter of material importance. It was his duty, at the earliest safe period, to assist by his recognition in the termination of the interregnum, so that citizens of the United States might be safely remitted to the care of that government for the security of their rights.<sup>26</sup>

But it has been proved that no interregnum existed and that

.....

25. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 4, 3128.

26. Senate Reports, op. cit., II., 19.



the Queen's government was in existence at the time the provisional government was recognized by Stevens so that he did not terminate any interregnum by his act. Furthermore, he paid no attention to the principles of international law which requires that in order to merit recognition as a *de facto* government it must be in possession of all government buildings and agencies. To say that it was immaterial when and how Stevens recognized the provisional government was to show disrespect for international law.

The Senate investigation committee gave its opinion that the President had the constitutional power to send Blount as a special investigating commissioner to Hawaii. The minority party objected at first, but it was shown that there were as many as 438 precedents. The first one to appoint a special agent was Washington in 1789, when he sent Gouverneur Morris as his private agent to make certain inquiries of the British cabinet concerning the disposition of that cabinet to carry out the treaty of commerce which had been made between the United States and Great Britian.<sup>27</sup>

President Monroe, April 18, 1820, appointed Luther Bradish, while Congress was in session, agent to collect such information in foreign countries in relation to the commerce of the United States.

John Quincy Adams on December 7, 1825, appointed Thomas Bolling, during a session of Congress, confidential, political  
.....

27. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 4, 3129.



and commercial agent to Cuba.

President Pierce, March 15, 1854, appointed C. W. Davis during a session of Congress, special agent to ascertain whether the Africanization of Cuba was in contemplation by Spain. <sup>28</sup>

Information that was conveyed in the minority report of the Committee on Foreign Relations made by Morgan of Alabama in 1888 in regard to what was then called the fisheries treaty with England, and as to the negotiation of which the same objections were strenuously made that are being made now--that the commissioners appointed by Cleveland with the Secretary of State to negotiate that treaty were appointed during the session of the Senate without its advice and consent. The minority report in regard to the treaty stated the following: "The constitutional power of the United States President to select the agents thru whom he will conduct such business is not affected by the fact that the Senate is or is not in session at the time of such appointment, or while the negotiations are being conducted, or the fact that he may prefer to withhold, even from the Senate the fact that he is treating with a particular power, or on a special subject. The secret-service fund that Congress votes to the Department of State annually is that from which such agents are paid. That is the most important reason for such appropriations." <sup>29</sup>

.....

28. Congressional Record, op. cit., XXVI., pt. 4, 3130.

29. Ibid., XXVI., pt. 4, 3130.



The report of the Senate Committee agreed with President Cleveland on the protectorate and flag question. It states that Minister Stevens acted without authority, therefore, that act was void for want of power; that it was the duty of the United States government to disavow the protectorate and haul down the flag.<sup>30</sup>

The report did not mention what was to be done with the troops which were on shore to carry out the protectorate. If the act of proclaiming a protectorate was without authority, the placing of troops on shore to carry out that act must also be without authority, therefore, they should have been recalled at the time the protectorate was disavowed. It is possible that the question concerning the troops was ignored because it had been argued before that the troops were needed for the protection of life and property, and to say now that they should be recalled would be a contradiction of the first argument.

In summing up the points, therefore, it has been found that President Cleveland was right in his assertion that the landing of the troops in Honolulu, January 16, 1893, was an act of war, because no troops can be landed in a foreign country without the consent of the government of that country unless it is for the bona fide purpose of protecting the lives and property of their own citizens. The United States troops were landed in Honolulu, January 16, 1893, without the consent of the Hawaiian government.

.....

30. Senate Reports, op. cit., II., 20.



Two protests were made against this landing of troops. One was made by Parker, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the other by Cleghorn, Governor of Oahu. Minister Stevens answered these protests by saying he would do whatever he thought was for the welfare of all concerned. Cleveland also pointed out that troops were not landed for the purpose of protecting American life and property but to help establish the provisional government. This has also been proved as there was no need of troops for the protection of American life and property because they were not in any peril or danger. Honolulu was in its customary state of tranquillity. Indeed, it seems as if the people did not even know that a revolution was in progress and were surprised at the landing of the troops. Then again, in their protests Parker and Cleghorn promised ample protection to American life and property if it were necessary. At the time of the landing of the troops the queen's government was in possession of all government buildings, barracks, and police station and was thus a government both de facto and de jure, and would have been able to cope with the situation if the United States troops had not been landed for the purpose of overawing the Hawaiian government. No interregnum exists in a country where they have both a de facto and a de jure government, and where this same government is in possession of all government buildings and agencies.

The United States troops were not favorably located if they

.....



were to be used for the protection of American life and property. They were quartered at Arion Hall about seventy-five yards west of the Hawaiian government building and in direct line with the palace which was about 350 yards to the north. If they were intended for the protection of American life and property they should have been stationed near the American quarters which were in another part of the city and not near the Hawaiian government building and palace.

It has also been proved that the provisional government would never have proclaimed but for the troops in the immediate vicinity. The Committee of Safety had taken an inventory of the guns which could be used by the revolutionists, but they had not been collected and no army had been organized. The fact that they depended on the United States troops was brought out clearly by several witnesses in their testimony. Soper who was made commander of the provisional troops did not want to accept the command before he was assured that Stevens had promised to aid them by landing the troops and by recognizing the government as soon as they should be in possession of the government building.

Undoubtedly Stevens promoted the change of government in Hawaii. His correspondence with the State Department shows clearly that he was very much interested in the annexation of Hawaii to the United States. During the investigation it was brought out .....



very plainly that the revolutionists would never have dared to overthrow the constitutional government if they had not been sure that Stevens would aid them by landing the troops and by recognizing their government before it was a de facto government. Of course in all his official correspondence he was careful to say that the troops would be landed for the protection of American life and property, but the leaders of the revolution understood unofficially that he would give assistance and that he was interested in the undertaking.

Minister Stevens had no authority to declare a protectorate over Hawaii without special instructions from the United States government. Being he had no such authority his act was void for want of power and was disavowed by this government. As there is no principle of international law that justified the hoisting of the American flag or the establishment of a protectorate it should be disavowed and the flag hauled down and the troops recalled.

Therefore, President Cleveland was right when he said that the landing of American troops in Honolulu, January 16, 1893, was an act of war; that the troops were not landed for the purpose of protecting American life and property but to help establish the provisional government; that the troops were not favorably located for the protection of American life and property, but was favorably located to command the Hawaiian government build-

.....



ing; that the change of government was promoted by the diplomatic representative of the United States; that he was entirely within his constitutional right when he sent Blount as a special commissioner to Hawaii to make an investigation; and that he did his duty when he ordered the flag to be hauled down from the Hawaiian government building and the troops recalled.

It has also been proved that the case put up against Cleveland in the Senate report consists of assertions without any evidence to uphold them or to prove that they are true. The Senate case rested on what Morgan described as an interregnum, which according to him existed after the declaration by the Queen of her intention to proclaim a new constitution. At any rate it had no existence in fact, for the Queen did not make her threatened move and there was no suspension of authority in Hawaii for a single moment. It has been proved that the Queen's government was still in power at the time when Morgan held there was an interregnum. As a consequence, his whole case falls, and the remainder of this Senate argument which rests upon his report must for the same reason be regarded as of slight value and as having little bearing on Cleveland's Hawaiian policy.

.....



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### SECONDARY SOURCES

- Encyclopaedia Britannica, XI., New York, 1929
- Alexander, W. D., History of the Hawaiian Monarchy and the  
Revolution of 1893, Honolulu, 1896
- Chambers, H. E., Constitutional History of Hawaii,  
Baltimore, Maryland, 1896
- Carpenter, E. J., America in Hawaii, Boston, 1899

### PRIMARY SOURCES

- Senate Reports, 53 Cong., 2nd Sess., Ser. No 3180, II.,  
Washington, D. C., 1895
- House Executive Documents, 53 Cong., 2nd Sess.,  
Ser. No. 3224, XXVII., Washington, D. C., 1895
- House Executive Documents, 53 Cong., 3rd Sess.,  
Ser. No. 3294, III., Washington, D. C., 1895
- Congressional Record, 53 Cong., 2nd Sess., XXVI.,  
pt. 1-7, Washington, D. C., 1894
- Messages and Papers of the Presidents, XIII.,  
New York, 1897
- Hoar, G. F., Autobiography, II., New York, 1903